

# ANSWERS

TO SOME

## QUERIES

CONCERNING

ISM, TOLERATION, &c.

IN A

## LETTER

*To a Friend*



...ing first, that the Sin of Retaliation was ...  
... that they did not only call off their ...  
... and it was dangerous to ...  
... and ...  
... know how to call Evil Good, and Good Evil. The ...  
... concerning the Sin of Retaliation and ...  
... the ...  
... in that ... which brings in ...  
... and when ... they ...  
... under ...

...  
...  
...

London, Printed in the Year MDC.

ANSWER

TO SOME

QUESTIONS

CONCERNING

CHISM, TOLERATION,

IN A

LETTER



was not long since that the Son of Man was born  
in the world, and that he did not only come to  
redeem us from all unrighteousness, but also  
to purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous  
of good works. This is the true light, which  
came into the world, and which hath  
given light unto all men. And yet many  
men have preferred darkness before light,  
because their deeds were evil. And they  
that love darkness are hated of the world.  
And yet they say, We are not guilty,  
for we have received the Son of Man,  
and we have believed in him. But they  
that do not receive him, they shall be  
condemned. For the Son of Man  
is come in the flesh, and he  
is the true light, which  
lighteth every man that  
cometh into the world.

And yet many men have preferred darkness  
before light, because their deeds were evil.  
And they that love darkness are hated of the world.  
And yet they say, We are not guilty,  
for we have received the Son of Man,  
and we have believed in him. But they  
that do not receive him, they shall be  
condemned. For the Son of Man  
is come in the flesh, and he  
is the true light, which  
lighteth every man that  
cometh into the world.

And yet many men have preferred darkness  
before light, because their deeds were evil.  
And they that love darkness are hated of the world.  
And yet they say, We are not guilty,  
for we have received the Son of Man,  
and we have believed in him. But they  
that do not receive him, they shall be  
condemned. For the Son of Man  
is come in the flesh, and he  
is the true light, which  
lighteth every man that  
cometh into the world.



AN ANSWER

TO SOME  
QUERIES  
CONCERNING  
SCHISM, TOLERATION, &c.

In a LETTER to a Friend

SIR,  
I Receiv'd your Letter with some *Queries*, but I cannot imagine what made you pitch upon me (when you are acquainted with so many Learned men) to Answer 'em. But to let you see how willing I am to give you the best Satisfaction that I can, I have here sent you the Opinions of some of our most Celebrated Episcopal Divines, that out of them you may frame Answers to all your *Queries*; And if you are not Satisfied with what I have Collected out of 'em, you may have recourse to their Books your self.

If

If you say that the Authors I have quoted are but Private men and their Writings of no Authority; I must Answer, that most of their Books have past an *Imprimatur*, or, which by some is look'd upon as Tantamount, The *Approbation* of the London Divines. If you say further That their *Practices* have in some Cases contradicted their *Principles*, I must say, that that is nothing to me, Let them look to that. If their Principles be Sound and Orthodox that's all that I desire, let them Answer for their Practices.

As for the Preliminary Questions, I have likewise taken the Answer to them out of the same Writers, as you? And upon the point.

Art. 19.

The first Question that you propose is this, *What is meant by the Church?* But before a distinct Answer can be given, you must know that the word *Church* has various significations; Sometimes 'tis taken for the *Place* where people *Assemble*, and sometimes for the *People assembled*; Sometimes for the *Whole Church* including the *Church Triumphant*, which is in *Heaven*, as well as the *Church Militant*, or the *Visible Church* here on *Earth*; Sometimes for the *Catholick Church Represented*, or a *General Council*; Sometimes for the *Catholick Church Diffused* or the *Whole Body of Christians*; Sometimes for the *Church Universal*; Sometimes for a *Particular Church*, &c.

Q. *What is meant by the Church in General or the Catholick Church?*

Dr. Lloyd's Sermon on Acts 2.42. The Church [ *Ecclesia* ] among Christians in the largest use of the word, is the whole Multitude of Believers joyn'd together in One Body, or Society under One Head, Jesus Christ.

Or,

Bramhall's First View. P. 23. The Catholick Church is the Whole Church of Christ spread abroad thro' the whole World.

Id.

The Universal Church is the Company of Christians knit together by the Profession of the same Faith, and the Communion of the same Sacraments, under the Government of *Lawful Pastors*.

By *Catholick Church*, is meant the whole number of Christi-  
 ans in all Ages and Places, admitted into the Church by Baptism,  
 and gather'd into Particular Churches under their respective Pa-  
 stors, and Bishops, United to one another, and to Christ their  
 Head, by the Profession of one Faith or Religion.

*Q. What is meant by a Particular Church?*

A. By a *Particular Church* is meant a Number of Men pro-  
 fessing Christianity, form'd into a Society under Lawful Gover-  
 nours, and govern'd by such Laws, and Rules, as are not diffe-  
 rent from but Agreeable to the Laws of the Catholick Church.

*Q. What is meant by a National Church?*

A. The whole Body of Christians in a Nation, consisting of  
 the Pastors, and People, agreeing in that Faith, Government, and  
 Worship, which are Establish'd by the Law of the Realm.

*Q. What is meant by a Representative National Church?*

A. The *Representative Church* of a Nation, is the Bishops and  
 Pastors of the Church meeting together, according to the Laws  
 of the Realm, to consult and advise about Matters of Re-  
 ligion.

*Q. What is meant by the Church of England?*

A. The Church of *England* is a Society of People, which in  
 this Nation are united under the same Profession of Faith, the  
 same Laws of Government, and Rules of Divine worship.

Or,

By the Church of *England*, I understand that Body of Men,  
 who, as to Church Affairs, are united together, under the same  
 Church Officers, the Bishops, Priests and Deacons, and  
 Communicate with them, and with one another, in all Religious  
 Offices, according to the Liturgy, and Orders of our Church,  
 Profess the Christian Faith according to the Ancient Creeds, and  
 the 39 Articles, and are govern'd according to the Canons and  
 Laws of this Church.

Or,

The Church of *England* is a Community consisting of profess'd  
 Christians, united in the same Government, Doctrin, and Wor-  
 ship according to the 39 Articles and Homilies; Her Liturgy,  
 Canons and Laws, and divided into Parochial Assemblies, for the  
 more Convenient worshipping of God.

Q. What is meant by a Diocesan Church?

1. The Notion of a Church ( by the ancient Canons ) was the same with that of a Diocese, or such a number of Christians as were under the Inspection of a Bishop.

Thom.  
dine  
p. 39.

A Church is the Body of Christians contain'd in a City, and the Territory of it, for the Government of such a one the respective Authority of the Apostles, convey'd by the Overt Act of their Ordination, was visibly vested in a Bishop; in a number of Presbyters, for his advice and assistance: and in Deacons attending upon them, and upon the executing their Orders.

Ham.  
of  
p. 508.

Q. What is meant by a Parochial Church?

A Parochial Church is a Company of Christians united under the care of a Pastor, in Subordination to the Bishop of the Diocese.

Ham.  
of  
p. 508.

Q. What consists the Unity of the Church?

Ecclesiastical Unity consists in preserving all those Relations wherein each member of the whole Church of Christ is concerned one towards another; and this Unity is either of Subordination or Equality.

Ham.  
of  
p. 508.

Q. What consists the Unity of Subordination?

The Unity of those Members that are Subordinate one to the other consists, in the constant due subjection and Obedience of all Inferiors to their Lawful Superiors; and in due exercise of Authority in the Superiors towards all committed to their Charge.

Ham.  
of  
p. 508.

Q. What consists the Unity of Equality, or fellow Members?

A Unity of fellow Brethren consists in the performance of all Mutual duties of Justice and Charity towards one another.

Ham.  
of  
p. 508.

Q. What is meant by Communion?

A Communion supersedes nothing to Unity but the Relation of external Association, whether by Assembling for the worship of God in the same place, where the matter is capable of it, or whether by Letters Communicatory by which we maintain external Communion with those who are far distant from us.

Ham.  
of  
p. 508.

Or, Communion with a Church is joining with a Church as a member of that Church.

Q. What



Q. *What destroys the Unity of the Church?*

A. Schism.

Q. *What is Schism?*

A. Schism is a Division in or from a Church.

Doct. of  
Sch. p. 40.

Or, Schism is a Voluntary dividing or a Separating, or receding of any Member from the Unity of the Body, i.e. the Church of Christ.

Ham. of  
Schism.

Or, Schism is a Causeless Separation from a true Church.

Doct. of  
Sch. p. 40.

Q. *What is meant by Schism from the Church of England?*

A. Schism from the Church of England is a sinful dividing from, or dissolving our Union and Communion with her, in her Government, Members, Worship or Assemblies. This is the least sinful manner by Schism from the Church of England, and is called Separation Negative; which is made Positive and more formally such, when those that have separated, set up their Altars against Her, and erect other Congregations in Opposition to Her.

Doct. of  
Schism.  
p. 45.

Q. *What is meant by Negative Separation or Schism?*

A. Negative Schism is when men do peaceably and quietly withdraw their Communion from the Church, in part or in whole, to enjoy their Conferences in a private way.

Q. *What is meant by Positive Separation?*

A. Positive Separation is when persons, thus withdrawn, do gather into a Distinct and Opposer Body, setting up a Church against a Church, to worship God in a separated way themselves; which Schism calls setting up Altar against Altar.

Id. p. 60.

Q. *What is a Schismatick?*

A. A Schismatick is he that divides himself from the Church of God, he that goes out, or withdraws, or recedes of his own

Ham. of  
Schism.

Q. *What is an Excommunicate person?*

A. An Excommunicate person is one that is cut off or separated, and cast out of the Church by the Governours of the Church.

Ham. of  
Schism.  
p. 508.

From the Definitions, I think these Conclusions or Propositions will naturally follow. viz.

1. That the Christian Church is a Society.

2. That the Church is but one Body, tho it consists of many particular Churches and Diocesses as Members of it.

That

3. That the Church is govern'd by *one* Supreme Head.
4. That the Supreme Head of the Church is Christ.
5. That under this Supreme Head there have been always *ordinate* Governors.
6. That those Subordinate Governors were first the Apostles, constituted immediately by Christ himself, over the whole Church, and after them the Bishops, as Successors to them, in particular Churches or Diocesses.
7. That all Bishops in their several Districts or Diocesses have full power, as to Spirituals, over the whole Flock.
8. That all the Members of the Church, within such Districts, owe subjection to their *Lawful* Bishops, as to those Commisſions by Christ.
9. That as Christ did ordain the Apostles, and the Apostles Bishops, for the Government of the Church; so the Bishops have ever since ordain'd Priests and Deacons, to take care of, and to keep the Church in subordination to them.
10. That all Christians are oblig'd to become Members of some particular Church, where the Sacraments are administered, and Communion enjoy'd under the Authority of some Canonical Bishop, or in Communion with some Priest, owing and submitting to some Bishop of the Catholic Church.
11. That all those, who break the *Unity* of the Church by actual Separation from the Communion of their *Lawful* Bishop, and fellow Christians, are Schismatics.
12. That all those, that are united to, and in Communion with Canonical Bishops, and adhere to the Doctrine and worship establish'd in the Church of *England*, as contain'd in the 39 Articles, Homilies, Liturgy, Canons and Laws, are the true Church of *England*, and their Assemblies are true Churches.
13. That all those who separate themselves, as Schismatics, and all those that are Separated, as *Excommunicate* persons, from the Governors of the Church, are out of the Communion of the Church.

Still. *rev.*  
*reas. of se-*  
*par.* p. 209.  
*Vindic. of*  
*the Ch. of*  
*Eng. from*  
*Schism.*  
 p. 16.

Q. Is all Separation Schismatical?

A. Tho' Schism be always a Sin, yet there may be such Circumstances which may make a Separation not to be a Schism. That you may know when Separation is Schismatical and when not, you must understand that there are three great Bonds of Communion, *viz.* Faith, Worship and Government; and whosoever shall separate from any Church, whereof he is a member in

of these, he or they so doing cannot be acquitted from the guilt of Schism, unless the Corruption in some one, or more of these be so great as to render the Communion sinful to him who knows it.

*Q. What is meant by the first Bond, Faith?*

*A.* If a Church hold the Catholick Faith, (tho' her Members may differ in some controverted Points) pure and undefil'd, and impose no new Articles of Faith, as terms of her Communion, 'tis Schism to break Communion with that Church; but if she does impose new Articles of Faith, a Separation from such a Church is not only justifiable, but a Duty.

*Q. What is meant by the second Bond, Worship?*

*A.* If a Church have a pure Worship, as to its substance, tho' cleath'd with some accidental Modes, Rites and Ceremonies, to separate from such a Church is downright Schism, and the reason is, because all Ceremonies and Modes of Worship, being in their own nature *Indifferent*, cannot by being impos'd become sinful, and if not sinful, can never justify a Separation. But if on the other side, the Worship be polluted by Idolatry, or profane and immoral mixtures, or any other way be made such, as that the Members of the Church cannot Communicate without sin; Separation from such a Church is not only warrantable, but absolutely necessary, and the Schism must lie at the door of the Imposers.

*Q. What is meant by the third Bond, Government?*

*A.* If the Church of which we are Members, be governed by *Lawful* and *Canonical* Bishops, and they act according to the Rules of the *Catholick* Church, then to separate from them is a damnable Sin, and a pernicious Schism; 'Tis a denying of Christ himself, who appointed them to rule the Church in his stead: But if they are, either not *Lawful* Bishops, but *Intruders*, or not *Orthodox* but *Heretical*, then they that separate are not only not Schismatics, but the true Church, and they that cause the Separation the Schismatics.

To confirm what is said, I have subjoyned some few Testimonies, by which it will plainly appear.

1<sup>st</sup>, That, tho' Separation be sometimes a duty, yet if the Faith be *sound*, and the Worship *pure* and *incorrupt*, Separation is sinful.

2<sup>d</sup>, That Separation from the Communion of *Lawful* and *Canonical* Bishops, is Schismatical.

1<sup>st</sup>, That



1st. That (tho' Separation be sometimes a duty, yet) if the Peace be *found*, and the Worship *pure* and *uncontaminated*, Separation is *sinful*.

*Unreason. Separ.* Violation of the Unity of the Church, where there is no sufficient reason to justify it, is a sin as much as Murder is, and as plainly forbidden.

*Pres. to Unreas. of Separ.* My Judgment being, that a causeless breaking the peace of the Church we live in, is really as great and as dangerous as Murder; and in some cases aggravated beyond it.

*Sherl. Vind. of Def. p. 395.* To Separate, where no sinful terms of Communion are imposed, is a causeless Separation.

*Doct. of Sch. p. 66.* Separation is unwarrantable, if Communion with the Church may be without Sin.

*Id. p. 102.* Renouncing Communion, or denying to Communicate with any Church, upon any dislike, or for any cause, *except sin*, is properly Separation and Schism: it is not actually not communicating with a True Church, but renouncing Communion, the which makes the Schismatick.

*Id. ibid.* Schism is directly a Breach of Unity; as that is a Breach of Charity. Refusing to Communicate with a true Church, when I have opportunity, especially my own Church, is a plain breach of both, whatever my reason be, short of *Sin*.

*Bramhal. Just. Vind. p. 10.* There may be an Actual Criminous separation of Churches, which formerly did joyn in one and the same Communion; and yet the separators be Innocent, and the persons from whom the Separation is made be Nocent and Guilty of Schism; because they gave just Cause of Separation from them: it is not the separation but the Cause that makes the Schism.

*Norris Charg. Sch. p. 93.* Wherever—there is no necessity of Separating, there the Church has a Right to Communion, which to withhold from her is Schism, or else there is no such thing as Schism in the World.

*Ans. to the Kings Pap. p. 106.* A part of the Catholick Church may have so many errors and corruptions mix'd with it, as may make it necessary to Salvation to leave it.

*Unreason. of Separ. p. 213.* There are three Cases wherein the Scripture allows of Separation. 1st, In Case of Idolatrous worship. 2ly. In Case of false Doctrine impos'd instead of true. 3ly. In Case men make things indifferent necessary to Salvation, and divide the Church upon that account.

I do not charge those with Separation, who under *Idolatrous* Id. p. 148.  
or *Arian* Princes, did keep up the exercise of true Religion a-  
gainst the will of the *Magistrate*.

There are many false Teachers, that transform themselves in Long's  
to Angels of Light—But if they teach any thing for Doctrine Pref. 102d.  
contrary to the word of God, any Doctrine that tends to Im-  
piety, *Disobedience* or *Divisions*, it is our duty to reject and withhold Sep.  
Communion from them.

It is beyond question that there may be such Corruptions in  
Doctrines, and such *Idolatrous* practices requir'd in Worship, Id. Ep. 20  
as may justify a Separation. the Char. of a Sept.

The Divines of the Church of England, first prov'd that the  
Communion of the *Romish Church*, was not Pure and Apostoli-  
cal, and thence justifi'd the Separation of the Church of England  
from it, as necessary, &c. And on the Contrary, They have  
prov'd that the Communion of the Church of England is Pure  
and Apostolical, and thence condemn the Separation of the Dis-  
senters from it, as Needless.

God only bids me obey the Church in such Cases as are not  
delin'd by the Law of God; but doth not give the Church leave to  
Command any thing contrary to God's Law, nor oblige me to  
attend to it, or Obey it, if it should so Command. Faith and  
praise of  
Ch. Eng.  
c. 3.

We do still hold and teach, that the Condition of our Com-  
munion [with the Church of Rome] was made sinful, by professing  
False Doctrine, Believing Lyes, and joyning in *Idolatrous Wor-*  
*ship*; and so it was unlawful and intolerable; and they who  
practise such things themselves, and would impose them on others,  
are actually in Separation from the true Church. Long's  
Char. of  
Sep. p. 6.

Schism indeed we do say is a Damning Sin, but there may be  
Divisions, where there is not always the guilt and formality of  
Schism, &c. Sermon  
Nov. 4.  
1680.

The principal Acts of Christian Communion, consist in Christian  
Worship; and, if any Church have so corrupted Divine Wor-  
ship, that a good Christian must not joyn in it, we must of ne-  
cessity abstain from their Communion. Id. vind. of  
the Def. p.  
323.

No Church can oblige a man to believe what is False, or do  
what is Unlawful; and rather than do either he must forsake the  
Communion of that Church. Kings pap.  
p. 100.

If you ask, by what Authority we Separate? [from the R. C.]  
I answer by the same Authority, which makes it Unlawful for  
Id. p. 68.

us to *Profess* what we do not believe, and to *Practise* what we believe God has forbidden.

*Difference of the Case* Neither abroad nor at home can we purchase Unity of Communion at so dear a rate, as to break God's Commandments for it.

*Id. p. 44.* We do Unanimously acknowledge, that if this Church make the Profession of false Doctrine, or the breaking of God's Commandments a condition of her Communion, They that upon the account Separate from her Communion, are before God clear of the guilt of Schism, in so doing.

*Vind. of Ch. E. from* When it is a Sin to Communicate, it is not a Sin to Separate.

*Sch. p. 34. Doctr. of Sch. p. 66.* Separation from a true Church is sometimes Lawful, if one cannot remain in its Communion without Communicating in her Sins.

*Vind. of Ch. E. from* Suppose a particular Church, tho' Lawfully Constituted and Established under Lawful Governours, should make the Terms of her Communion such as Her Neighbour Churches, could not without Sin and Danger, hold Communion with her; would Separation in this case be adjudg'd a Schism? Or would it not rather be lookt upon as their Duty and Interest to withdraw from her?

*Id. p. 25.* If Schism be consider'd as a Separation from the Communion of some particular Church, then 'tis imply'd, that possibly there may be such cause given as may justify the Separation; and so then the guilt of Schism will lie at the door of the Church which gives such cause, and not at his or theirs who Separate therefrom——No cause can justify a Separation save only this, when a Church makes the Terms of her Communion such as cannot be comply'd withal without Sin. And in this Case methinks it is very plain, that it cannot be Sin to Separate, when it is Sin to Communicate, for no Laws of Men can abrogate or dissolve the obligation of the express Laws of God.

*Sherlock.* When we cannot obey our Spiritual Rulers, without disobeying the express Laws of Christ, the reason of our Communion with such a Church ceaseth, because it does not answer, (nay contradicts) the end of Christian Society, which is to have fellowship with the Father and his Son Jesus Christ. 1 Jo. ii. 3.

*Bramhal.* If any Patriarch, Prelate, Church or Churches shall enjoyn such Duties to their Subjects——it is very Lawful for their

jects to disobey them, and for Strangers to separate from them.

As in the Case of Usurpation, the owning of the Lawful King is a Voluntary Act, but if an Usurper threatens to banish him, if he does not abjure him, upon whom must the blame be laid, upon the Man's voluntary Act, or the Usurper's Voluntary Imposing such a Penalty on those who do nothing, but what is just?—The making such Terms of Communion is a voluntary Act too, and being a thing Unreasonable and Unjust, it leaves the blame on the Imposers.

Vind. of  
Ans. to the  
King's  
Pap. p. 67.

I held it better to seem undevout, and to hear no mens Prayers, than to be forced, or seem to comply with those Petitions, to which the Heart cannot consent, nor the Tongue say Amen, without contradicting a mans own Understanding, or being his own Soul.

I had rather be condemn'd to the Wo of *Va Vobis Hypocritis*, by seeming to pray what I do not approve.

En. lib.

Id.

If any Bp. Metropolitan or Patriarch, with open face asserts manifest Heresy, or false Doctrine, which hath been so declar'd by approv'd Councils, the disowning all Communion with him, and Subjection to him, even before a Council, is commended by some Canons, as a practice which deserves Honour. And it must be so, where Subjection must include Embracing Corruption.

Falk. Chr.  
Lib. p.  
269.

Secondly, That Separation from the Communion of Lawful and Canonical Bishops is Schismatical.

It is the Law of the Gospel and the constant Profession of Saywell the Christian Church, that all Persons, as well Clergy as Lay-men, must live in Obedience and Communion with their own Bishops, as long as they profess the Catholick Faith, and uphold such a publick Worship, wherein it is Lawful to joyn, and in the right performance whereof, we may obtain Salvation.

P. 340.

The crime of Schism does manifestly lie upon those who refuse Obedience, to their Lawful Bishops in all just Commands.

Id. p. 11.

Not only the Greek, Abyssine, Russian, Churches, but the Protestant Churches, do all with one consent, condemn them for Schismaticks, which separate from the Lawful Pastors of any Temp Church (—) and set up Churches against Churches, and Communion against Communion, &c.

Id. p. 355.



Id. 388.

It is undoubted, that it has been the constant Doctrine of the *Greek, Eastern, Northern and Southern Churches*, as well as *Roman* in all Ages, that Christians ought to be in subjection to their Respective Bishops; and he was held cut off from the Catholick Church, that did separate from his *Lawful* Bishop, or was excommunicated by him; and no other Church could receive him, till Repentance and Reconciliation to his *Own* Bishop, and 'tis the same at this very day.

Faith and  
Pract. Ch.  
Eng. man  
chap. 3.

I reckon my self bound to obey the Commands of my *Lawful* Governors, both in Church and State, not only for Peace and Order sake, but for the sake of God, who hath Commanded me so to do, and am willing to forego my own Rights, office, and deny my own Profit, rather than disobey, or oppose a Command of my *Lawful* Governors, where I can obey without Sin—God only bids me obey the Church, in such cases as are not defin'd by the Law of God; but doth not give the Church leave to command any thing contrary to God's Law, nor oblige me to attend to it, or obey it, if it should so command.

Vind. of  
Ch. Eng.  
from Sch.  
p. 34.  
Vind. Def.  
Still. p.  
401.

Schism implies the casting off a *Lawful* Jurisdiction to which we were oblig'd to yield Subjection and Obedience.

Government and Discipline is necessary to preserve any Society, and therefore obedience to Ecclesiastical Governors is a Necessary term of Church Communion; and let a man be never so sound and Orthodox in Faith and Worship, if he be of a restless and turbulent Spirit and disobedient to his Governors, and their orders and Constitutions, he deserves to be flung out of the Church Communion, if he do's not Separate himself, and will be Damn'd for't too without Repentance.

Sherl.  
Vind. of  
Def. p.  
452.  
Id. 453.

Communion with the Bishop is Essential to the Notion and Unity of an Episcopal Church.

Those only Communicate with their Bishop, who submit to his Pastoral Authority, and partake with him in all Religious Offices, and those who do not, according to the notion of the Catholick Church, are Schismatics, and therefore not of the same Church with him.

Sherl.  
def. of  
Still. p.  
254.  
Id Vind.  
def. p.  
126.  
Id. vind.  
def. p. 331.

When men consent to be Christ's Disciples, they consent to submit to that Authority Christ has instituted in his Church.

It has been the constant practice of the Apostles, and all succeeding Ages, to set Bishops and Pastors over particular Churches, and to confine their Care and Inspection to them.

Episcopacy has been the Establish'd Government of the Church of England, ever since the Reformation; and for any Christians

to Separate from their Bishops, was always accounted Schism in the Christian Church, unless there were some very necessary reason to justify such a Separation.

There is no other way of submitting our selves to the Authority of Christ, but by a regular Subjection to the Discipline and Government of the Church.

I know no way of Judging whether any Man be in Communion with Christ, but by his Communion with the Church. There is no visible Communion with God and Christ, but by a visible Communion with the Church.

Subjection to Christ requires Subjection to that Authority which Christ has set in his Church, as well as Obedience to his other Laws.

To plain we disown Christs Authority when we reject those who Act by his Authority.

An obstinate refusal to obey the Imposition of Lawful Bishops and Pastors makes Men Schismatics.

Whoever is a Member of any particular Church, and refuses all due Obedience to the Pastors and Governors thereof, doth thereby contract the guilt of Schism.

—As it is *Hereby*, to depart from the Faith which they [The Apostles] Preached; so is it *Schism* to depart from the Authority which they left in the Church till the Worlds end.

Whoever by virtue of any Authority under Heaven shall Usurp Ecclesiastical Power, shall Usurp the Succession of the Apostles, and take it from them that Rightfully stand possess of it upon pretence of Governing the Church by such Laws, as he is really perswaded, but falsely, to be commanded the Church by our Lord and his Apostles, this whosoever shall do, or be accessory to, is guilty of Schism.

Suppose a Prosperous Usurper in this Kingdom had gain'd a considerable interest in it, and challeng'd a Title to the whole, and therefore requir'd of all the Kings Subjects within his power, to own him to be *Rightful King*: Upon this many of them are forc'd to withdraw, because they will not own his Title: Is this an Act of *Rebellion* and not rather of true Loyalty? Schism in the Church is like Rebellion in the State.

There are some things immediately necessary to the Salvation of particular Christians, whether concerning Faith or Good Manners; and there are other things necessary to the publick Order and Peace.

*Peace* of the Church, that by it Christians may be edify'd in all matters of the first kind. The denying any point of the first kind, may, for distinction sake, be call'd *Heresie*, when a man is resolute and obstinate in it. But in the other kind, it is not false opinion that makes a man a Schismatick, till he agree to destroy the Unity of the Church for it. It can scarce fall out indeed, that any man proceed to destroy the Unity of the Church without some false opinion in Christianity. Yet it is not the opinion, but the *Destroying of a true, or erecting of a false Power* in the Church that makes Schism.

*Faith and Pract. Ch. Eng. Man. c. 27.* Whatever discouragements the Clergy have found, they have preach'd up, and perswade Loyalty to the King; and by the Doctrine of Passive Obedience to Temporal Authority, keep People from Rebellion, notwithstanding they have been so often scold'd and abus'd with it: But yet out of modesty seldom insist on the Obedience that is due to the Church and Ecclesiastical Authority, tho' there is as much obedience due to *Her*, as even to the Church of *Rome* from her members.

*Cath. Bell. p. 44.* As the Faith which we have in the Principles of Christianity, is the foundation of all Christian Graces in the Soul, and the inner dispensation of Eternal life; so is Episcopacy the Foundation of all visible Union and Government in the Ecclesiastical Body, inasmuch that were there no one Bishop left in the world, the Integrity at least, if not the very Essence of the Church would be destroy'd.

The sum of what has been cited upon this *Query* amounts to this, viz. That if any Church makes the terms of Her Communion sinful, by framing new Articles of Faith, or by imposing false Doctrines for true; or by corrupting Divine Worship by Wicked, Idolatrous or Blasphemous Prayers, then she is Schismatical, and those that Separate from her truly Catholick: But if she imposes no false Doctrines, nor no new Articles of Faith, and enjoys nothing in the service of God, but what is innocent, decent, and tending to Edification, then those that Separate from her are a Schismatical, and she a Catholick Church. 2ly, If any Church disobey the Lawful Commands of their Spiritual Governors, or throw off their *Rightful* and *Canonical* Bishops, and Communicate with the *Usurpers* and *Intruders* into their Sees, they are Schismaticks.

3ly, If any wholly reject *Episcopacy*, they destroy the very Foundation of Christian Unity.



Q. Suppose there be more Bishops than one in a Diocese, with which of them must the People Communicate?

A. Almost all Heresies and Schisms, that have distracted the Church, have been no other than so many Defections of the discontented part of the Clergy, and the more Pragmatical part of the Layety from their Rightful Bishop. *Non aliunde Hereses obor- scuntur, aut nata sunt Schismata quam inde quod Sacerdotes non obtemperant*; Schisms and Heresies spring from no other cause than Disobedience to the Bishop: *Inde Hereses oborta sunt, dum Episcopus qui unus est, Commemorat*. All the disturbance of the Church is purely for want of observing that Precept of the Apostle; Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit your selves, for they watch for your Souls, as they that must give account: i. e. Obey those that are Rightfully over you, and submit to them, not choosing your selves new Teachers, and running after your own fancy: which *Irenaeus* seems to paraphrase, as he is cited by *Antiochus*. "Let the People assemble where the Bishop is present; the Sheep ought not to go wandring whither they please, but as the Shepherd leads them. The People ought to follow the Directions of their Bishop, and conclude what he orders to be most pleasing to God."

No City, how great soever, had more than one Bishop: This is so well known that it would be great impertinence to go about to prove it by Instances—and besides, the Bishops of most Cities if not all, had a considerable Territory belonging to their Jurisdiction, which was commonly the Country lying round about their City.

In great Cities, there was one chief Ecclesiastical Governor called Bishop, to which all both Priests and People were subject and was Schism and no Communion, to do any thing without his Allowance and Direction.

It was an inviolable Rule among them, [the Africans] that there was to be but one Bishop in a City, tho' the City were never so large, or the Christians never so many.

One of the greatest and most pernicious Schisms that ever happen'd, might have been prevented, if they had yielded to more Bishops than one in a City; and that was the Schism of the Donatists.—The Novatian Schism began at Rome upon the like occasion.

Id. 249. To set up *one Bishop* against *another* is to set up *Altar* against *Altar*, as that *Phrase* is commonly us'd in *St. Cyprian* and *St. Austin*.

Long's  
Ans. 10  
Hales's  
Sch. p. 107. Our Author [Mr. Hales] proves the *Donaists* in two lines to be complete Schismatics. 1<sup>st</sup>, For choosing a Bishop in *Opposition* to a former. 2<sup>d</sup>, For erecting new places for the dividing party to meet in publicly.

Id. p. 180. He [Mr. Hales] says truly that all Meetings upon unnecessary occasions of Separation are to be stil'd Conventicles, so that in this sense a Conventicle is nothing else but a Congregation of Schismatics, and he had before determin'd them to be Schismatics that do choose a Bishop in *Opposition* to the former, and that do erect a *New Church* and *Oratory* for the dividing party to meet in publicly.

Saywel  
of Un.  
193. The Laws and Customs of all Churches do condemn it for Schismatical, for a man to come into another Ministers charge.

The summ of what is cited on this *Query* is this, that they ought to be but one Bishop in a Diocess or City, that they that set up a Bishop in opposition to the *Rightful* Bishop, and make separate Meetings, setting up *Altar* against *Altar* are Schismatics, and therefore those that would avoid the guilt of Schism must constantly Communicate, with the *First* and *Rightful* Bishop, be never with the *Intruder*, or his *Adherents*.

Q. *Are the People that Communicate with Schismatical Bishops and Presbyters guilty of Schism?*

Ham. of  
Schism out  
of Ignati-  
us. A. A Schismatick is an impious Son, which, having contemn'd the *Bishops* and forsaken the *Priests* of God, dares constitute another *Altar*.

Doctr. of  
Schism.  
P. 45. The Schismatics are they, that having left their *Bishop*, set up for themselves abroad another false Bishop, and all their *Adherents* are involv'd in the same guilt, who *join* with the Schismatics against their *Bishops*.

Def. of  
Dr. Str  
P. 471. —An essential part of our Communion with our Bishop is to live in Communion only of those *Presbyters*, who live in Communion of their Bishop, that is, who officiate by his Authority, and are subject to his Directions and Orders. This was a standing rule in *Ignatius* his time, as is evident from his Epistles.

bles, that Presbyters must do nothing in the Church but by the Bishop's consent or order, and those who do, are Schismatics, and those people who adhere to them in it, *partake* in the guilt of their Schism, &c.

'Tis notorious in all the Histories and Canons of the Church, Saywel of that never any more than *One Bishop* at a time was allowed in *Unity*, any of those great Cities [*Jerusalem, Alexandria, &c.*] (—) And p. 392. If a Schismatick did sometimes creep in, as the *Novarians* and *Donatists* did in troublesome times, they were always condemn'd by the Church, which did constantly maintain There ought to be but *One Bishop* in a City or Diocess, and all Priests and Lay Persons ought to be govern'd by him.

To assemble and celebrate the Eucharist, besides the Bishop's Thord. appointment, was then [in St. Ignatius his time] the due mark *Prim. Gov.* of a Schismatick. Ch. p. 117.

If the Church unites upon Schismatical Principles, whatever Sherl. *Ans.* the Bishop does in pursuance of such Principles is the Act of the *to Anonym.* Church; and if the Bishops be Schismatics, the Church is so too.

The Church is by St. *Cyprian* defin'd to be a People united to *St. Cypri-* their *own* Bishop, and a Flock adhering to their *own* Pastor, *an.* whence you may know, [the Bishop always to be in the Church, and the Church to go along with the Bishop; if therefore the Bishop be a Schismatick, so must all the Flock that Communi- cate with him.

If any Presbyter, condemning his *own* Bishop, shall make a *Long* Separate Congregation, and erect another Altar, his *own* Bishop *Ch. Sep.* nor being condemn'd of any Irreligion or Injustice, let him be *p. 85.* depos'd, as one that is Ambitious, and a Tyrannical person, and in like manner, all that *Adhere to him*; and let the Lay People be Excommunicated, after the Bishops third Admonition.

He who submits to, or complies with the manager of a Schism, Falkner's in his prosecution thereof, doth involve himself in the *same* *Christian* crime. *Loyalty.* p. 272.

Q. If a Bishop, or other Clergy man, be guilty of any Offence, by whom is he to be Try'd and Punish'd?

A. Touching the Depriving or Degrading of Bishops, Presby- Field of ters and Deacons, the ancient Canon requires the Concurrence *the Ch.* and consent of 3 Bishops for the Censuring and Depriving of a p. 512. Deacon;

Deacon; of 6 for the Depriving of a Presbyter; and of 12 for the Censuring, Judging and Deposing of a Bishop.

*Vind. of* If a Bishop be Convicted of Heresy or Schism, or some great  
*Def. p.* Wickedness and Injustice, his Colleagues (*that is*) Bishops may  
*128.* Depose him, and forbid his People to Communicate with him, and Ordain another in his stead.

*Hills Cath.* For one particular Primate or Metropolitan to censure any  
*Balance.* Bishop by himself, or to be incapable of censure in his own  
*p. 86.* Provincial Synods, hath no Precedent in the primest and purest Antiquity. The Canon Apostolical (33) directing, That every Bishop of every Nation give deference to him, *that is* Chief among them, and to esteem him as their Head, and to do nothing extraordinary without his Cognisance, his every one only to do such things which are expedient to his own Diocese, and to the Country under him. And so neither must the Capital Bishop do any thing without the consent of them all, for thus there will be an Unanimity, and God will be glorify'd thro' the Lord in the Holy Spirit.

*Faith and* Bishops had over their Presbyters and People, Supreme Power  
*Pract. Ch.* under Christ, as to Church affairs, and Accountable only to  
*Ang. m.* Christ, and to a Council of their fellow Bishops, often Meeting  
*cap. 1.* and Consulting together for the good of the whole.

*Bishop of* A Bishop of the Church of England, by all the Law in the Christian Church in all ages, and by the particular Law of this  
*Lond.* Land, in case of offence, is to be Try'd by his Metropolitan  
*Tryal. p. 6.* and Suffragans.

*Id.* The Bishop of London's Council urged in behalf of the Bishop, for not suspending Dr. S. without a Legal process.

*M.* That absolute Suspension supposes a proof of the Crime, and That where there is an absolute Suspension, there ought to be Citation, Form of Proceeding, Judgment and Decree; and that to Act otherwise is contrary to the Laws of God, of Nature, and of all Nations in all Ages, and was never known in the World.

My Lord,

*Id. Bp. of* I Always have, and shall count it my duty to obey the K. in  
*London's* ever he Commands me, &c. But in this, I humbly conceive, I am  
*Letter to* oblig'd to proceed according to Law; and therefore 'tis impossible for  
*my Lord* me, to comply; because, tho' His Majesty Commands me only to execute His Pleasure, yet in the capacity I am to do it, I must do  
*Sunder-* as a Judge; and your Lordship knows no Judge Condemns any Man  
*land.* before he have knowledge of his Cause, and have cited the Party.—From what  
*1729* that will never be Unfaithful to the K. &c.



( 39 )  
To suspend is a Judicial Act, which cannot be done without By. London's Council. hearing the Cause. When the King commands a Judge, he commands him to Act as a Judge.

The Ecclesiastical Commissioners would not declare the Bishop of London suspended, till he had been fully heard.

The Prince of Orange in his Declaration, represents the proceedings against the Bishop of London, as one of the great Grievances he came to redress; 'The Commissioners (says he) suspended the Bishop of London, only because he refus'd to obey an Order that was sent to him to suspend a worthy Divine; without so much as *Citing* him before him to make his own Defence, or observing the *Common forms of Process*.' P. O. Declaration.

The substance of what is said in answer to this Query is

1. That a Clergyman cannot be regularly *depriv'd* but by Bishops.

2. That a Clergyman cannot be *suspended* but by a *Legal Process*.

3. That a Bishop cannot be *try'd* or *depriv'd* but by his Collegues, that is, Bishops.

4. That those that are *depriv'd*, without a *Hearing*, or by *Incompetent Judges*, cannot be so properly said to be *Depriv'd* as violently *Thrust* from their Places; and therefore it will follow,

5. That a Bishop being not *Regularly Depriv'd*, is, to all intents and purposes, the *Canonical Bishop* of his See, and a Priest the *True and Lawful Pastor* of his Flock; and the people consequently owe obedience to Them, and cannot forsake their Communion without incurring the guilt of *Schism*.

Q. Were not the Protestants in Q. Mary's days guilty of Schism, in making Separate Meetings under the then *Depriv'd Bishops*?

A. I willingly grant that in times of manifest Corruptions and Persecutions, such as the *Roman* and *Marian* were, Private Meetings are *Lawful* and *Necessary Duties*; because if men do forbid what God has Commanded, it is better to obey God than Man. Long's An. to Hales of Schism p. 147.

'Tis plain that the Schism is on the side of the Papists, who upon pretence of Papal Authority, did withdraw themselves from the Communion of their own Bishops, [after an Universal agreement and concurrence in the Communion of the Church] Reform. justify'd p. 6.

of England for ten or eleven years together] and make a formal division in the Church, which was before united in Peace and Truth.

14. p. 14. The Popish Bishops, that were set aside in Q. Elizabeth's Reign, did possess the places of *Lawful* Bishops, yet living, or united themselves to such as did possess them, therefore they were Schismatical, and no *Lawful* Bishops of the Church of England. For as soon as these *Lawful* Bishops were turn'd out, others were put into their places, and not only so, but contrary to all rule and orderly Government in the Church. For the most certain fundamental Constitution of the Church in all Ages; and the constant Order of all Societies (which is always tacitly support'd, tho' not formally observ'd) is That while Particular Churches lay to the Faith and Unity of the Catholick Church, as ours had done, all things ought to be managed by the Arch-Bishop and Bishops of the Province, and so by the Chief Governors and main Body of the Society, all things cannot regularly be done.

14. p. 17. 'Tis confess'd that 14 or 15 Bishops were turn'd out, or went away in Q. Elizabeth's days; but according to our Author's own Argument, they were Schismaticks and no *Lawful* Bishops, because they came into the places of *Lawful* Bishops, while they were alive, or else were Ordain'd by, and Communicated with such Schismaticks. I add they *Usurp'd* their places by turning out the Metropolitans, and Major part of the Bishops of each Province, and so could have no *Lawful* Authority, or Jurisdiction.

14. p. 18. The true Right and Authority of the Church was in those *Lawful* Bishops, that were made in R. Edward's days, and that was the True Church of England which did adhere to their Constitutions.

14. p. 20. They [Q. Mary's Bps.] were no *Lawful* Bishops, because they either did Schismatickally invade the places of the *Lawful* Bishops, or else were willingly Consecrated, and did joyn in Communion with those Schismatical Bishops: When the Queen [Elizabeth] therefore did set them aside, she did but dispossess men, who had no just Right, and remove those by her Civil Authority, who had no Power, but what they had by Force, and the Secular Consecration.

14. p. 25. All else but *Thinly*, were ordain'd by, or Communicated with them during their Schism and Usurpation, and therefore neither

the Ordainers, nor Ordained had any Right or Jurisdiction in the Church of England.

That which is Essential, and the Authority and Power to execute the sacred office of a Bishop, or Priest in their respective Charges, is deriv'd from the Bishops of the Province; and after great violence and disorder, from as many, or the major part of them, which survive. II. p. 27.

Every Bishop and Priest orderly constituted in his place, do's II. ibid. act by the Power and appointment of the Catholick Church, and they condemn the Catholick Church, that desert and disturb them in the performance of their Office. Hence we may understand our Saviours meaning, when he says, *If he neglects to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an Heathen man, and a Publican*: which in the first place do's require us to hear our own particular Parish Priest, and Bishop, whilst they are constituted, and live in the Unity of the Church, but principally it does oblige us to hearken to the Catholick Church. So that if our own Pastors turn Hereticks, or set themselves up by undue means, and not according to the Order of the Church, they are not to be hearkned to, but we must according to our Saviour's Command, *Hear the Church*, and not those Pastors that will not themselves *Hear and Obey the Church*.

The Popes Usurp'd Authority, and his Prohibition of joyn-  
ing with our English Bishops, made the first Schism, and is the Saywell of  
Union  
hindrance to keep them from now joyning in Communion with p. 307.

For the first 10 years of Q. Elizabeth, the Papists did Com-  
municate with us, till the Bull of Pope Pius IV. Faith and  
Pract. Ch.  
An. 1552. tho'  
our Reformation was then fully settled. So that they are bound of Eng-  
to answer it, why they joyn not still in Communion with man  
C. 1.  
us.

We can say, the Pope never had any settled and quiet Pos-  
session, and exercise of Power here, at least for any considera-  
ble time together, as is at large evident from what Mr. Prynne  
and others have Collected; and all our Statutes of *Provisors*, and  
*Promissors* do show how little hold here the Pope was by our  
Government allow'd, or own'd to have. And tho' many did Ap-  
peal to Rome, it was against Law; and therefore that gives the  
Pope no more Right here, than many Peoples being Traiterous,  
and paying Homage to an Usurper, doth annul the Right and  
Title of the Lawful Prince.



Reform.  
Justify'd  
p. 29.

The Church of England Bishops are guilty of no Schism, from the Church of Rome; their order is undoubted, and their Succession uninterrupted, and so their Title and Authority is as firm and unquestionable as any upon earth; and they must be Schismatics before God and the Catholick Church, that do not submit to them, and joyn in their Communion in all Lawful things.

If we look over the ancient Canons of the Church, we shall find two things very plain in them.

Mischief  
Separ. p.  
29.

Can. Nic.

Can. 6. 15.

16.

Constan.

c. 6.

Chalced.

17, 20, 26.

Antioch.

c. 2.

Codex

Ecl. Af-

ric. c. 53.

c. 55.

Conc. Gang.

c. 6.

Constan.

c. 6.

Conc. Cas-

thag.

10, 11.

St. Cyprian

Ep. 40. 42.

Theod.

Ecl. Hist.

l. 1. c. 22.

l. 2. c. 24.

c. 17.

Vincent.

c. 16.

1. That the Notion of a Church was the same with that of a Diocess; or such a Number of Christians as were under the Inspection of a Bishop. Or, 2<sup>d</sup>. That those Presbyters who rejected the Authority of their Bishop or affected *Separate Meetings*, where no fault could be found with the Doctrine of a Church, were condemn'd of Schism. So the followers of *Eusebiius Sebastenus*, who withdrew from the publick Congregations on pretence of greater Sanctity and Purity, in *Paphlagonia*, were condemn'd by the Council at *Gangra*; So were those who Separated from their Bishops, tho' otherwise never so Orthodox, by the Council at *Constantinople*, and the Council at *Carthage*; wherein before *S. Cyprian* had so justly complain'd of the Schism of *Felicissimus* and his Brethren, who, on pretence of some disorders in the Church of *Carthage*, had withdrawn to the Mountains; and there laid the foundation of the *Novian* Schism. But when false Doctrine was impos'd on Churches, as by the *Arian* Bishops at *Antioch*, then the people were excus'd in their Separation; So at *Rome* when *Felix* was made Bishop; and at *Sirmium* when *Photinus* publish'd his Heresie; but I do not remember one instance in Antiquity, wherein Separation from Orthodox Bishops and setting up Meetings without their Authority and against their consent was acquitted from the Sin of Schism.

The substance of what is contain'd in the Answer to this Query amounts to this, viz.

1. That *K. Edward's* Bishops were True and Canonical Bishops And the Popish Bishops in *Q. Mary's* days Intruders.

2. That those that adhered to *K. Edward's* Bishops in *Queen Mary's* days, altho' depriv'd, were the True Church, and consequently those that forsook their Communion were the Schismatics.

Q: Whether a Particular Church, ( suppose the Roman ) being Schismatical, yet keeping possession of all the Churches, may be said to Separate?

A. Yes. For Private Meetings, in such a case, commence Churches, Hales. and the Churches become Conventicles, according to the Definition given of a Conventicle above. viz. That a Conventicle is nothing else but a Congregation of Schismaticks.

If Rome has, by the many Additions, &c. err'd, she may be said to have left, and gone from, or be separated from that First, Holy, Catholick and Apostolick Church, without making an open Schism or Schismatical Separation. — So far then as any Church now in being shall depart from the Doctrine of the Ancient, Catholick Church, and profess great and many errors, and broach new Doctrines, unknown to the Primitive Churches, and lay mighty stresses upon them, so as to make them necessary for Communion here, and to Salvation hereafter; such a Church may be said to Depart or Separate it self, from that Ancient, One, Holy, Catholick and Apostolick Church.

It is true, That they who first desert and forsake the Communion of their Christian Brethren, are Schismaticks; but there is a Moral Defection, as well as a Local.

In a word, he that forsakes the Assemblies of Catholick Christians is a Schismatick, not he that goes not to a Church: for wherever Christians, tho' in a Den or Cave of the Earth, worship God, in the Unity of the Church, there is the Church of God.

Bramhal  
Just. Vind.  
p. 10.

Q: Are the Dissenters Schismaticks?

A. Yes doubtless, For they not only set up separate Meetings in opposition to Bishops, but renounce all Episcopal Authority, and usurp the Power of Ordination, which did always belong to the Order of Bishops.

As for the Government of the Church, we are assur'd partly from Scripture, and partly from the Earliest Antiquity, That the Order of Bishops and Metropolitans, rests upon Apostolical Institution. Both Timothy and Titus, in the judgment of the most Learned Presbyterians, were Superiour to the rest of the Clergy, within their Districts, at least in Jurisdiction, if not Order.

Letter concerning the  
necessity of  
Regulating  
the Presbytery  
p. 18.

—The Bishop presided over a City, and the adjacent Villages and Territories; where a Temporal Magistrate was likewise plac'd.

As

As the *Metropolis* of every Province had its *Proconsul* in the State, so it had its *Archbishop* or *Metropolitan* in the Church. And when the Government of *Patriarchs* prevail'd, it was form'd after the same Model, either in Imitation of the *Vicars* or *Lieutenants* that presided over a *Diocess*, compos'd of several Provinces; or at least in Imitation of the *Prætorian Prefects* that had several *Dioceses* under their Jurisdiction.

Saywel of  
Unity.  
p. 318.

All those that set up Altar against Altar, and hold Separate Congregations contrary to the Law of this Church, are to be held as *Schismatics*, and were condemn'd for such by the ancient General and Particular Councils, and all the *Catholick Fathers* and *Martyrs*, and thought not fit to be receiv'd into *Christian Communion*, or accounted lively members of the *Catholick Church*.

Id. 395.

As 'tis a high crime to Affront a Judge duly Commission'd, so it is no less than Rebellion for an able Lawyer, without a Commission, to assume to himself the Office and Authority of a Judge. And why it should be in *Temporal* Judges, and not in *Spiritual* appointed by God, as the *Bishops* are in the opinion of this Lord Chief Justice, [*Hales*] I cannot see; I am sure 'twas ever thought so by all sober Christians, till our unhappy Rebellion nurs'd People up in *Schism* and *Disobedience*.

Thorn-  
dike prim.  
Gov. of  
Chr. p. 197.

Were it [*Episcopacy*] but an *Human Ordinance* of yesterday, establish'd by due course of right, let me be bold to say, that *Armin* withdrew his Submission to it, he must come within *Epiphanius's* list of *Hereticks*: not understanding an *Heretick* in *Augustin's* sense, to be none but he that will not believe some point of Doctrine necessary, as the means of Salvation, to be believ'd: but, according to the latitude of the Word, taking all to be *Hereticks* that make *Sects*, and Assemble themselves apart besides the Church of God Lawfully Settled.

As for *Episcopal Ordination* that was accounted as necessary, in the primitive Church, to the making a *Bishop*, *Priest* or *Deacon*, as *Baptism* to make a *Christian*: And unless the *Dissenters* can produce a better, that is, a more ancient Charter than the *Bishops* have, which I am sure they can never do, the sole power of Ordination must be still in them, and those that pretend to it must be *Usurpers*, and Consequently *Schismatics*.

Wind. of  
some Prot.  
Princ. P.  
108.

Dr. *Sherlock* says, but by what Authority I know not, That the Church of *England* does not deny, but that in case of Necessity, the Ordinations of *Presbyters* may be *Valid*. — But he says, with respect to the *Dissenters*, that the case of *Schism* is a different

present thing—and I believe, *say he*. Our Author himself will not say that Schismatical Presbyters may take this power, or that their Ordinations are valid, if they do. And this is the Case between us and the Dissenters: They ordain in a Schism; and tho' necessity may make an irregular Act valid, yet Schism will not.

The Novatians were Episcopal and so were the Donatists (says Mr. Vindic. of Baxter) and yet how have they been judged of for their Schism I need the Prim. to tell: They are very much to blame that say the Presbyterians Ch. p. 330. or Independents troubled the Primitive Church: It was impossible for them to be troublesome before they were at all: It seems all the Sects and Schisms of that time thought they had no right to pretend to be a Church, unless they had Bishops: But these Anti-Episcopal Separatists were reserv'd, it seems, for the last times, as the severest Curse, and Judgment that could befall the Church.

These Episcopal Schismaticks indeed divided the Church, but these quite Dissolve it.

It has been the Tradition and Doctrine of the Christian Church in all Ages, even from the Apostles time to this very day, that no Ordinations are valid or ought to be made, but by Bishops, to whom the greatest Authority of governing the Church is committed. Saywel of Unity p. 324.

I admire this [Episcopal] Government and Institution, because under it I am in no doubt of the Validity of the Ordinations of our Ministers, Or of the Validity of the Sacraments by them Administred: For we have our Orders by a continu'd Succession from the Ancients, and so from the Apostles, which is the only ordinary way, that I know of, for a Man to be Commissionated to act in Christ's Name. Faith and Practice of a Church of Eng. man Cap. 1.

I suppose no man will deny that all Ordinations in Schism, are Meer Nullities, tho' made by persons rightly Ordain'd, because against the Unity of the Church. Thorne-dike's Rs. of the Ch. p. 147. Review of Mr. M. Hs. Notion of Schism. p. 50.

We believe with St. Jerom, that the power of Ordaining belongs only to the Bishops; and your [Dissenters] Ordinations made by Presbyters are all Void and Null; and, till you can prove the Contrary, we take you for no more but a parcel of Lay-intruders into those holy Functions to which you have no right, (those of you only excepted who have been Episcopally Ordain'd.)

In the first place, I must put him in mind, That as no Man is to meddle with the Sacred Offices (Except he be called of God) no Man to preach except he be sent: So no Man is to call or send



as from God; but he that is authoriz'd by him for that purpose. Neither can I see any Reason why a Man may not as well be a Minister of Jesus Christ, without any Mission at all, as by the Mission of those persons who never were sent themselves.

Id. p. 53.

I believe there never was any case of *Absolute Necessity* for Lay Ordination; but if possibly such should happen as the Gentleman mentions, [of a Company of Lay-men being cast upon an Island, or remaining in some Country, when their Pastors are all kill'd, or turn'd Hereticks] I am apt to believe that *Bishops and Ministers duly ordain'd* might be had from other Countries, and if we methinks it would be reasonable and fit, that we should first see what God would do in such Cases, before we presume to do anything of our selves, for which we have no Scripture warrant.

Vindic. of  
the Prim.  
Ch. p. 550.

*Basil* is so resolute upon his prerogative, that he will not allow they [*Chorepiscopi*] should ordain as much as the inferior Clergy, as Deacons, Sub-deacons, Readers, and several others, which the Church of that time reckon'd among the Clergy, without his consent; and if they do, let them know (says he) *Whoever is admitted without our Consent, shall be reputed but a Layman*. What would he have said if they had pretended to ordain Presbyters or Bishops in opposition to them? The Bishops of the Church of *England* desire no more than *St. Basil* assum'd. They would be reputed Priests or Deacons that were ordain'd in their Dioceses without their Consent, and that by Lay Presbyters, who were never *Chorepiscopi*, or had any Character to distinguish them from other Presbyters. Therefore the Cause will not to be reckon'd so hard, as it is Commonly represented by the more moderate Nonconformists, who pretend this power of Re-ordination the only Bar that keeps them out of the Church, since there was never any other Church, nor any in Antient times would have received them upon any other terms: but they must have remain'd *Nonconformists* under *Rast*, *Attila*, and all the Ancient Bishops, whose names are, and always have been had in Veneration with all Christians; nor one of these would have ever been perswaded to own a Pastor that his Presbyters had ordain'd in opposition to him, nor hardly could they have been prevail'd with to admit such as any other Bishop might ordain within their Diocese; So extream punctilious they are in this matter, and there is hardly any one thing that caus'd so frequent and dangerous contentions between them as the power of Ordination.

Q. *May Orders given in a Schism be made afterwards valid?*

A. Tho, as was said above, all Ordinations in Schism are meer Nullities, and tho made by persons rightly Ordain'd, yet we find such Ordinations made valid, by the meer decree of the Church, without Ordaining a new, as the *Meletians* in *Egypt*, by the Council of *Nice*, in *Epiphanius* and the Church *Hilberies*; and as Pope *Melchisedes*, much commended for it by *St. Austin*, offer'd, to receive all the *Dunelm* in their own ranks, besides divers others that might be produc'd.

The only reason why some things, tho they be ill done, yet are to stand good, is, because the power that doth them extends to them, but is ill us'd. So when the power is Usurp'd, as in all Schism, or when that is done, which the Law makes void, it can be to no effect. Therefore when the Act of Schism is made valid,

it is manifest, that the Order of Bishop and Presbyter, is order'd in point of Right, by the meer consent of the Church, which by the precedent Ordination was Confer'd only in point of Fact, being a meer Nullity in point of Right.

It hath been often practis'd by the Church, to receive not only *Schismatics*, but even *Heretics* also, (that is, Such as had receiv'd orders of those, that parted from the Church, upon an Error of Faith) in their respective Orders. But always, upon Condition of *Renouncing* the Cause of their Division; whereupon they were to receive the Blessing of the Church, by prayer with imposition of hands. The reason was because neither is Baptism in Schism essential to Salvation, nor Ordination in Schism effectual to Grace, by Ministry of any Office in Schism. But being *Renounc'd*, there remains no cause, why their Ministry should not be effectual to their People; Their Baptism and their Ministry to their own Salvation, supposing it sincerely renounc'd. Therefore the reason why they who are Ordain'd by Presbyters cannot be receiv'd in their respective Orders, is peremptory; Because the Schism, Continuing in ordaining against Authority, cannot be *renounc'd*, unless the Ordination be voided. For so long as the Ministry may be Usurp'd upon such Ordination, so long is the Schism on foot.

I can see no reason why the line of Ordination may not pass thro a Schismatical Church; for altho by Schism people are out of the Church, and while they Continue so, cannot enjoy the benefit either of Ordination or Sacraments; yet to say, that both are absolutely destroy'd, and Nullify'd; so that a Schismatick loses the Characters, and can neither be a Christian nor a Bishop

( i e ) not the subject of Apostolical power, till he be again  
 ordain'd and Ordain'd, is an Assertion beyond all that I could  
 yet meet with. The *Melicans* were Schismatics, and yet  
 ordain'd by *Melians* were receiv'd into places where others  
 could not be receiv'd. I think that Orders and Regularity of Episcopal Succession  
 will suffice to make them *Lawful* Bishops, who for corruption  
 the Doctrine of the Church, shall not be allow'd to be  
 ones.

*Q. Whether Toleration will excuse from Schism?*

*Ans. A.* An Act of Parliament would deliver the Dissenters from  
 Temporal Punishments, and might deliver them from the  
 Disobedience to Civil Governours; But the guilt of Schism  
 remain still, unless he [ Mr. H. ] thinks the *Donatists* were  
 Schismatics, when *Jalsor* the Apostate with an unting de  
 granted a *General Toleration*. So that this project may secure  
 Estates, but cannot secure the Souls of Dissenters; Schism will  
 remain, tho' they should get it establish'd by Act of Parliament.

*Norris* There is nothing more or less in a *Toleration*, than a  
 Charge of the Penal part of the Law. This is all that it  
 and perhaps more than it ought. For I believe there ought  
 be no such thing as a *Toleration*, and that tis more than  
 the Church or State can Rightfully grant.

*Id. p. 80.* We do not derive the Grounds of Obligation to Ecclesiastical  
 Communion from the Authority of the *Civil Law*; (tho' that  
 be allow'd to add a considerable weight to the Obligation)  
 also, and chiefly from that of the Divine Law; which I conceive  
 be as positive and express in requiring Unity and Conformity  
 Worship, as in requiring any Religious Worship at all.

*Blackhalls* No License given, no Toleration granted, no Exemption from  
 Temporal Penalties in case of Separation allow'd by men, is  
 Jo. 6. 66. ent to excuse from the guilt of Schism those that Separate  
 P. 14. the *True Christian Church*, whereof they were Members, or to  
 their Schism no sin.

*Id. p. 15.* Human Lawgivers may give leave to their Subjects to be of  
 Religion, or to be of no Religion; but if they do, they can  
 it Lawful in it self, either to be *Atheists* or to profess a *false*  
 gion, or to forsake the Communion of the *True Church*; for to  
 here a God and to worship publicly, and to worship him in



Assemblies of the Faithful, are Duties that are laid upon us by a higher than any humane Authority; and therefore no humane Authority can discharge us from them.

The Law can take away and discharge us from no Obligation, but that which its self laid on us; so that all the meaning of the largest and most unlimited Toleration that the Law can grant, is no more than this *viz.* a Declaration that Men shall not be liable to any Temporal Mulcts or Penalties, or be any ways punished by the Civil Power, upon the account of any Differences in Religion, or for being of no Religion at all; but if antecedently to the establishment of any Church by the Civil Power, and if antecedently to the enacting any Penal Laws to oblige men to hold its Communion, it was Schism to separate without cause, from that Christian Church whereof we were Members, and such Schismatical Separation was a Sin before God; then so it will be still, notwithstanding any License or Toleration that can be granted by the Secular Power.

Toleration is not only a means to encourage those that are already engag'd in Schism, to continue so, but by experience is found the most effectual way to multiply new Swarms of Schismatics.

Saywel  
of Unity.  
P. 137.

When a particular Church enjoys a *Civil Establishment*, it receives, as it were, a new Authority; in as much as it becomes a *Civil Right* or *Property*: So that unless its Constitution is *Materially* vicious and sinful, its a high piece of Injustice to destroy or infringe any of its *Establish'd Rights* or *Immunities*. But yet since the Magistrate is only the *Guardian*, not the *Founder* of a National Church, (its Original Authority resting on certain positive *Laws* and *Sanctions* enjoy'd by a Power Superior to that of the Magistrate, even that of God Himself,) wherever a Church in any Province or Nation, professeth the True Religion by an Orthodox Faith, and a pure worship under *Lawful Church Governours* and *Pastors*, that is the *True National Church*, in opposition to all Dissenting *Sects* and *Parties*; tho' it wants the Authority of a *Civil Establishment*.

Letter a-  
bout Reg-  
ulating the  
Presb.  
P. 22.

It is indisputably evident that the *Christian Church* is one Society, *Id.* p. 15.  
or *Body* of Men united to CHRIST, and each other in certain Ex-  
ternal, as well as Internal and Spiritual Bonds of Union.

Its certain one great design of Christianity, is *Unity*; or to range *Id.* p. 23.  
all the Parts and Members of the Church of CHRIST into an *Holy*  
*Building*: and therefore if the Magistrate is Constituted a *Guardian*  
of the True Religion, all his offices of *Success* and *Protection* must  
be directed to this end; I mean the Bonds of *Catholic Unity*,  
through-

throughout his whole Dominions. Without this, the Great end, and Proposals of sacred and holy a Religion, cannot be accomplished; and therefore whatever Indulgences or Exemptions the Christian Magistrate may rightfully grant to *Erroneous Judgments, or Conscience*, acted with simplicity and a pious Disposition; he cannot upon the *Laws and Oeconomy of the Gospel, or any Authority deriv'd to him from thence* rightfully give a *Positive establishment*, within the Districts of the same Government, to two *Opposite Communion'd* *Alters of worship*; especially when one of them is founded in a *Revolt*, from a *Pure and Orthodox National Church*. This is the very reverse to a *Protector and Defender* of the *True Religion*. So great a Sin did the Ancient Fathers account Schism, before the happy Union of the Church and Empire, when the Meetings of the Schismatics were as much *Tolerated* by the State, as the Meetings of the Catholics; and upon the same principle *Damnis* and *Abominis* were accounted as damnable sins every day, under the Reigns of those Emperours, who granted *Tolerance* to them, as under the Reigns of those who made Laws against them. Nay all the Laws which *Constantine* and *Valens* made in favour of *Arianism*, and for the Establishment of it, did not alter its damnable nature in the judgment of the Catholics; neither indeed is the obliquity of Schism alterable by Human Laws and Constitutions, as being a Transgression of a Divine Positive Law, which God hath made for the preservation of the Body Politick of his Church, to which Schism is as destructive in its Nature, as Rebellion is to the State.

Apologet  
Vind. of  
Ch. Eng.  
P. 92.

Q. Whether Persecution or Force will Excuse from Schism?

Id. p. 91.

A. If the Church of England be a truly Catholick Church, as the Divines of all Reformed Churches abroad will tell them [the Dissenters] She is, then they must be guilty of Schism, which is a Separation without a just Cause from the Church, as a Church, without any regard to the State. For Schism or Separation, without a just Cause, is a pure *Spiritual Crime*, and was reckon'd a Damnable sin, before the Church Christian was united to the Empire, as also in those unhappy Intervals of Persecution, when the Church and Empire were disunited again. For Example, it was a damnable sin when St. Paul charg'd the *Ephesians* to keep the Unity of the Spirit &c. It was a damnable Sin when he told the *Corinthians*, That they were all Baptiz'd by one Spirit into one Body, and that, as  
the

the Natural Body was made one by the Union of many Members in it, so also was the Body, meaning the Body Politick of Christ. It was a damnable Sin, when St. Ignatius taught the Churches, that nothing should be done without the leave of the Bishop, or in opposition to him, and that, that was only a valid Eucharist which was administred by him, or by one licens'd and appointed by him. And that Makers of Schism could not inherit the Kingdom of God. It was a damnable sin, when St. Cyprian call'd *private Meetings*, in Opposition to the publick *Conventicles of the Devil*; and said that private Altars were no Altars; and that if a Schismatick should die for Christ, he could be no Martyr, nor have any right to the Crown of Martyrdom; for which he alledges the words of the Apostles, *The I give my Body to be burn'd, and have no Charity, it profits Nothing &c.*

When great Exigencies force men to do any thing which otherwise they would not do, they are said to do it unwillingly, and to act against their judgments and Inclinations; and particularly when for fear of *ruining* and *Exterminating* Penalties, which *many speaking*, are intolerable, men conform to any Religion, which otherwise they would disown; tho as to outward Conformity and Communion, they are of it, yet they are not for it in their hearts. I Confess men ought to endure any thing, rather than to conform to any Religion, which they believe to be false; or subscribe to any Confession, which they believe not to be true; but yet we see the Frailey of humane Nature is such, that extreme severity will make them comply, against their Wills with a Religion they certainly know, and firmly believe to be false.

No humane Law can make that *Lawful*, which God has forbid; nor that *Unlawful* which he has Commanded.

No Church in the World can lay an obligation upon a Man to be dishonest, that is, to profess one thing and do another; which is *Disimulation* and *Hypocrisie*. And no Church can oblige a Man to believe what is *False*, or do what is *Unlawful*; rather than do either he must forsake the Communion of that Church.

Touching the *Worship of God*, since the Divine Establishment of the publick *Christian Service*, is contain'd in the Gospel, no Authority upon earth hath any right to prohibit this. And those Christians, who rightly *Worship God*, in the true Catholick Communion, according to the Apostolical and Primitive Church, have a right to hold such *Assemblies* for the Christian *Worship*, as appear useful for the Churches good, tho this should be against the Interdict of the Civil Power.

Seeing

Vind. Ans.  
to the Kgs.  
Paper.

p. 98.  
Id. p. 106.

Falkner's  
Christian  
Loyalty.  
p. 40.

Blackall  
Serm. p.  
17.

Letter a-  
bout Regu-  
lating the  
Press. p.  
14.

Thorndi.  
Rt. Ch. 1.  
5.

Id. p. 6.

Reflections  
on the  
Hist. pr. of  
Church  
Govern.  
p. 50.

Id. ibid.  
Thorndi.  
Rt. of the  
Chap. 233.

Seeing *Church Communion* is a Duty laid upon us by God; it plainly follows, That no Humane Authority can release us from our Obligation to it.

Sometimes Persecution it self is the most prolifick Soil for the True Religion to shoot forth and flourish in: *Christianity* had not only its first Foundation in it, but we are assur'd, received great Increase from it.

The primitive Christians frequented the service of God, when they were in danger of the Laws, because, that which the Laws forbid, was their Assemblies.

The main point of that Charter which makes the Church a Society is the Right of Assembling, and holding such Assemblies, without warrant, against all Law of the world that forbids it.

The *Christian* indeed is obnoxious to the power of the Prince, but *Christianity* is without the reach of his Sword.

Passive Obedience is our principle, and if this renders the Legal Establishment of our Religion more obnoxious to the pleasure of the Civil Magistrate, yet it better secures our Common Christianity.

The Head of every State is so absolute; over the Persons that make the Church, that the *Independent* power thereof, in Church matters, will enable it to do nothing against, but suffer all things from the Sovereign. And yet, so absolute, and depending on God alone, [is the Church] in Church Matters, that a Sovereign, professing Christianity should not only forbid the profession of that Faith, or the exercise of those Ordinances, which God has requir'd to be serv'd with, but even the Exercise of that Ecclesiastical Power, which shall be necessary to preserve the Unity of the Church, it must needs be necessary, for those that are trusted with the Power of the Church, not only to Disobey the Commands of the Sovereign, but to use that Power, which their Quality, in the Society of the Church, gives them, to provide for the Subsistence thereof, without the Assistance of Secular Powers. A thing manifestly suppos'd by all the Bishops of the Ancient Church, in all those actions, wherein they refus'd to obey their Emperours, is du'd by Hereticks, and to suffer their Churches to be regulated by them, to the prejudice of Christianity: Particularly in that memorable refusal of *Athanasius* of *Alexandria*, and *Alexander* of *Constantinople*, to admit the Heretick *Arius* to Communion, at the instant command of *Constantine* the Great. Which most Christian action whosoever justifies not, besides the appearance of favour to



an Heresy, he will lay the Church open to the same ruin, whenever the Sovereign power is seduc'd by the like. And such a difference falling out, so that, to particular persons, it cannot be clear, who is in the Right, it will be requisite for Christians, in a doubtful Case, at their utmost perils, to adhere to the Guides of the Church, against their *Lawful Sovereign*, tho' to other Effect, than to *suffer* for the exercise of Christianity, and the maintenance of the Society of the Church in Unity.

If it be here objected that this seems to strike at the Kings *Ob.*  
*Sovereignty &c.* It may be answer'd that,

*An.* Tho Kings and Princes are not properly Officers and Governors a distinct Church, as a Church, it being not a *Civil* or *Secular*, but of *Christ's Spiritual Society*; yet to them is to be given the external management of this Society, a power to settle its *outward Policy*, and to be the Moderators and Governors of it: Upon this account the Great *Constantine* stil'd himself a *Civil Bishop*, as being chiefly concern'd in the guidance and direction of the *outward* affairs of the Church. The Bishops and Pastors of the Church have their Ordination and decree their Commission from an higher power, even *Christ*; but they *Act* and Exercise it under the Protection of the *Supream Magistrate*.

Our Writers divide Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction into *Internal*, the inward Government which is in the Court of Conscience; or *External*, that which is practis'd in Exterieur Courts; That proceeds by *Spiritual Censures*; This by force and Corporal punishments; That is appropriated to the Clergy and incommunicable to the Secular power; This is Originally inherent in the Civil *Supream*, and from him deriv'd to Ecclesiastical Governors. *Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction*, when said to be annex'd to the Crown, ought to be understood in the latter sense.

We of this Church depend upon the King and Parliament for the *Legal Establishment* of our Religion, but not for the *Truth* of it; the former is changeable, because men are so, but the latter is not so, because God changeth not.

To destroy the *Legal Establishment* of a Religion is one thing, and to destroy the Religion is another, for all the *Sacredness*, that humane Law can give to a Religion is a *Legal Sacredness*, and no more, or if you please a *Legal Establishment*.

The Church of *England* thinks no Acts which are *Purely Spiritual* want the Kings Concurrence; her Sacraments and her Censures

*An.*  
A plain  
and fam.  
Disc. com.  
the Cath.  
Ch. p. 6.

Refled on  
Hist. pt. of  
Ch. Gov.  
pt. 5.  
p. 21.

*Anf. to*  
several  
Capt.  
Queries.  
p. 26.  
Id. p. 32.

Refled. on  
the Hist.  
pt. of Ch.  
Gov. p. 18.

tures the esteems valid *Independently* on all humane Authority. Her Charter she derives *immediately* from Christ. &c.

Ans<sup>r</sup>. to  
several  
Capt. Qu.  
p. 37.

The King is our Supreme Governor under God, but we know of no Supreme Governor that is to be obey'd absolutely, without any limitation whatsoever, but God himself.

Mafon.

The Kings supremacy in Ecclesiastical matters doth not impair the power of the Keys, which the King has not.

Andrews.

By the Supremacy we do not attribute to the King the power of the Keys, or Ecclesiastical Censures.

Bramhak.

We never gave our Kings the power of the Keys or any part of either the Key of Order, or the Key of Jurisdiction, purely Spiritual.

Thorn-

dike R. of  
the Ch. p.

4.

Tho the Church is not endow'd with any Coactive Power, by Divine Right, yet by *Divine Right*, and by *Patent* from God is endow'd with a power of holding Assemblies for the Common service of God, before any Grant of the Powers of the World, and against any Interdict of them, if so it fall out.

Id. p. 41.

The State is indow'd with no *Ecclesiastical Right*, tho it has great Right in Ecclesiastical Matters.

Id. p. 42.

As no State stands by the Gospel, so, no Right, settl'd by the Gospel, can belong to any State, or Person as a Member of any State.

Id. p. 43.

The Church subsisted 300 years before any State profess'd Christianity, whatsoever Rights it used, during that time, manifestly it ought therefore still to use and enjoy.

Id. 168.

Vid. Letter about  
Regulating  
the Presb.  
p. 12, 20.

The whole Right of Secular Powers in Ecclesiastical Matters, not *Destructive* but *Cumulative*, that is, That it is not able to defeat or Abolish any part of that Power, which by the Constitution of the Church is settl'd upon Ecclesiastical Persons, stands oblig'd to the Maintenance and Protection of it.

22, 24, 29.

Reflections  
on Hist. p.  
of Ch. Gov.  
p. 24.

The Power, by which the King Visits and Reforms, is *Spiritual*, but *Political*; That a Power is not given him to *declare Errors*, but to *Repress* them; That the Determination of Error is by Act of Parliament limited to the Authority of Statutes, four first General Councils, and Assent of the Clergy in Convocation; That the King hath not all the Power given him, which by any manner of Spiritual Authority may be Lawfully exercised (for he has not the Power of the Keys) but a Power given him to reform all Heresies by *Civil Authority*, which the Church can do by her *Spiritual*. That it is impossible it should be prov'd that this Power of visiting and Reforming is a

any Invasi<sup>on</sup> of the Office of Spiritual Pastors, because when the Prince doth it *by them*, Commanding them to do the work, and exacting of them a discharge of their Duty, he doth this without Usurping their Office, and yet doth it by a Power, distinct from and Independent on their's. And Lastly, that the Prince is oblig'd to take care that all Acts of Reforming be Executed by their *Proper Ministers*, because else he transgresses the Power prescrib'd in this Statute [25. Hen. 8.] *So to reform Errors as may be most to the pleasure of Almighty God.*

See Letter  
about Re-  
gulating  
the Presb.  
p. 12.

The Clergy did indeed [in Hen. 8 time] bind themselves not to Promulge and Execute any Canons without the Kings leave; the Execution, of which they abridge themselves, is such as has Influence on the *Civil Rights* of the Subject, and therefore necessarily requir'd the Concurrence of the Supreme Civil Power.

Id. p. 18.

It is confess'd that the extream of Raising the Ecclesiastical Power too high, in the times of Popery, had now produc'd another of Depressing it too much. But this was the Infelicity of the Clergy, not their Crime.

Id. p. 31.

It is certain that before the Empire was Christian, the Church was govern'd by its proper officers, as a Society distinct from the State, and Independent on it.

Bur-  
rough  
Episc.  
p. 12.

Who ever did account it Schism in the Gospel sense, and as the word is now used amongst Christians, to disobey the unjust Commands of the Civil Magistrate? Were Christ and his Apostles Schismatics? Were all the Primitive Christians Schismatics in Constantine's time? Nay, were there not Schismatics all that while the Church was a Society that had Laws and Government contrary to the Laws of the Secular Princes? For does not St. Paul tell the *Corinthians* that there were Schisms among them, and do we not find the *Novatians* accounted Schismatics, and many others long before Constantine's time? Nay moreover, were not the *Arians* Schismatics under the Reign of Constantine and Valens, tho they had the Edicts of the Emperour to favour them, which were then of as good Authority as our Acts of Parliament are now with us? Or if we should ever have a Popish Parliament, that should command us to go to Mass, and abolish the present Constitutions, should we be Schismatics for not obeying them? I hope not, there's no such matter — Christ has Pastors and Teachers in his Church, and has promis'd to be with them to the end of the World, and commanded all good Christians to obey them — The Church did subsist before the Magistrates fa-

saywel  
of Unity.  
p. 138.

your'd it, and may continue again, tho Kings and Parliament should leave of to protest it.

*Municip.  
Ecclef.*

P. 119.

We only are the Poor, Tame, Dispirited, Drowsy Body, that are in love with our Fetters, and this is the only Scandalous part of our *Passive Obedience*, to be not only Silent, but Content with an Oc—n of our P—rs which are not Forfeited, nor infeasible to any Worldly Power whatsoever.

*Thornd.  
Rt. of the  
Ch. p. 40.*

The Sovereign Power of the Church consisting in the Sword of *Excommunication*, upon which the Society thereof is founded, it is Necessarily manifest, that this power is not lost to the Church, nor Forfeit to the State that Professeth Christianity, and undertakes the Protection of the Church. For the Church and Civil Societies must needs remain Distinct Bodies, when the Church is ingrafted into the State, and the same Christian Members of both in regard of the Relations, Rights and Obligations, which in the same Persons, remain Distinct, according to the Distinct Societies, and Qualities of several Persons in the same. Therefore as no Christian, as a Christian, can challenge any Temporal Right by his Christianity, which, the State, wherein he is call'd to be a Christian, gives him not: So on the other side, no Man, by his Rank in any State, is invested with any Power, proceeding from the foundation of the Church, as it is the Church.

*Id. p. 237.  
Vid. Falk-  
ner's Chr.  
Loyal.  
P. 319.*

So far as *Excommunication* concerns barely the Society of the Church, any Person, Capable of Sovereign Power is liable to it upon the same terms as other Christians are, because, coming into the Communion of the Church, upon the same Condition as other Christians, the failing of this Condition, must needs render the Effect void.

*Vid. Casb.  
Bal. p. 110.  
Gr.*

But, if we consider, either the Temporal force, by which it comes to Effect, or the Temporal Penalties, which attend on it to These, which cannot proceed, but by the will of the Sovereign, it is not possible that he should be liable.

*Falkner's  
Chr. Loyal.  
P. 321.*

Princes, as well as any other Persons, must Submit themselves to the Power of the Keys, in the Undertaking the Rules of Repentance, so far as they are needful for procuring the favour of God, and obtaining the benefit of the Keys by *Absolution*.

*Id. 225.  
Vid. Casb.  
Bal. p. 118.*

The Pastoral Office of the Guides of the Church, doth extend it self even to Kings, with respect to the conduct of the Souls; but yet this doth not exempt them from being under the Regal Sovereignty.



The Habitual Jurisdiction of Bishops flows, we confess, from *Animado* their Ordination; but the Actual Exercise thereof in publick Courts *on 8 Thef.* after a *Coercive* manner, is from the gracious Concessions of Sovereign Princes. *P. 41.*

As for Causes *purely Ecclesiastical*, the Bishop being *Supreme* in his own Diocese, there can be no Original Right of appeal from him, for there is no appeal from the Supreme: He has a free power in the Government of his own Diocese, and must render an account of his Actions to Christ, who is the supreme Lord of the Church as *St. Cyrian* tells us. *Vind. of some Prot. prin. p. 88. and Vind. Def. P. 183.*

While the Clergy Faithfully discharge their office, the Prince ought to Protect them; and if for this they suffer, no doubt but they are Martyrs. *Animado. on 8 Thef. P. 52.*

When the Civil Power will not own the Church, The Ecclesiastical *Governors*, by their *own Authority*, may establish necessary Rules for Order, as in the Primitive times. *Falkner Chr. Loyal. P. 45.*

Bishop Taylor tells us from *Fulgentius*, that when *Frazamund* King of *Bisac* in *Africa*, had made an Edict under pain of Death, that no more Bishops should be Consecrated, designing by that device to have the Catholick Faith rooted out of his Dominions; the Bishops of the Province, no way affrighted at the Edict, met together and Consecrated as many as were wanting, considering that those who were worthy of a *Mitre*, need not fear to do their Duty, when by so doing they are sure to receive a *Crown* of Martyrdom.

If any such [Heretical or Infidel] Prince should design to dissolve our Succession, we have a Canonical right to preserve our Orders, and can but suffer Penalties, which may *Oppress*, but not *Null* or *Vacate* the Validity of our Ordination. *Hill's Cath. Chr. Loyal. P. 127.*

No Temporal Christian Powers have any Authority in themselves to *Usurp*, *Extinguish*, *Pervert*, *Alter* or *Retard*, but only to *Inspect* and *Assist* the regular operations of the Powers Hierarchical within its own bounds. So that whatsoever Offices thereof are Fundamental to the Catholick Faith, Charity, Union and Government of the Universal and each particular Church, and were receiv'd and practis'd for such in all Ages before the Empire became Christian, are not to be violated by any Acts of State. For if such violations were accounted Persecutions in Heathen Emperours and Princes, what can they be accounted in Christian ones? Of these Fundamental Rights therefore I shall subjoyn some Momentous particulars. *Id. p. 121.*

See Municipium Ecclesiasticum prim. 1697.

1. It was a Primitive and Fundamental Power and Duty of Bishops to convene in Synods without restriction.

2ly. All Ecclesiastical Rights are so Spiritual, that they cannot be by Allowance and Approbation of God or his Church vested in any one in form of a *Temporal Right*, but only on this Condition, that the parties intrusted with them, continue in the Unity of the Catholick Church, and their own Provincial Bishops, as Prelates of it, having immediate care of their Souls.

Municipium Ecclesiasticum prim. 1697.

What Princes have no *Rightful Authority* to do, that they may *irresistibly* do upon an *uncontroulable Domination* and *Impunity*. Upon which, when they presume to repress our Rights and Liberties, if it be in matters *Necessary*, they are to be disobeyed in Fact, and submitted to as to their Legal Processes without resistance.

Thornd. prim. Ch. gov. p. 89.

The Church is Subject to all Common-Wealths, where it is maintain'd, in *Temporal* matters: In those which concern the Soul, whom shall we think our Lord leaveth her in charge with, but those whom he trusteth with the Keys of his House?

Ans. to several Cap. Qu. p. 36.

Our Church acknowledges the King to be *Supreme* in all *Causēs*, and over all *Persons* Ecclesiastical. viz. that no Quality in the Church, nor Cause of the Church exempts a Subject from the *Secular Laws*, and the Sword of Justice; which may be very true, as it undoubtedly is, yet *all manner of Obedience* in Religious matters shall not presently become due to the King. For when *Sovereigns* require the Subjects to do things contrary to Religion, if their Subjects give but *one manner of Obedience* to their Laws, which goes with us under the Name of *Passive Obedience*, it saves at once their Acknowledgment of the *Sovereigns Supremacy* over them, and of *Gods Supremacy* over all. So that we are not oblig'd by our Oath to become Calvinists, &c. nor, in a word, to be of the King's Religion, but to submit to his Authority, let his Religion be what it will, &c.

H. p. 25.

If by [the *Parliaments*] charging the Church of England, you mean, that *Parliaments* can make the Religion, profess'd by the Church of England, to become a false Religion, when their Inclinations are once vary'd from us, then I tell you, that the Church of England is not *changeable* by *English Parliaments*, nor by all the Powers of the Earth: for this matter is fix'd to their hands, and can never be unfix'd to the end of the World.

No Ordinance of Secular State can deprive our Church of its Hill's  
essential Rights given us from God, but only lay Temporal Punish-  
ments on us, for the use of them, without their permission. Which  
if it be absolutely necessary for us at any time to do in Opposi-  
on to the State, Our Ecclesiastical Acts are not Null, but valid  
to all effects *Purely Ecclesiastical*, and we can but suffer, and de-  
spise the Penalty. *Cash. Bal. P. 99.*

The Romanists triumph that we have no Power to meet in  
*Commodum* without Royal Licence, nor at Liberty when there,  
to dispute one Question without the Kings Allowance, nor are  
our Conclusions valid without the King's Ratification, whether Ca-  
tholick, Heretick, Heathen, Turk or Jew, on pain, of hampering  
by *Premunire's*, &c. But here it is to be remember'd, that these are Im-  
positions of the State, for which the Church is not bound to ad-  
vocate if they are Persecutions: but if men would be just, they  
would pass the most favourable interpretations on publick Sancti-  
ons, and herein conclude, that these Statutes were intended; not  
for *Persecution*, but for *Caution* only against those extravagancies,  
which the Church had abus'd its freedom to, the Kings always  
graciously promising us, on request, opportunity, to Convene, and  
discuss our Matters, as to us shall seem Convenient, that we  
might have no cause to think that their Laws are intended for  
Persecution. And for the Kings Ratification it is justly neces-  
sary, not meerly to an Ecclesiastical effect, but that our Cen-  
sures, for breach of these Canons, may be seconded upon the  
Contumacious by the Writ *De Excommunicato Capiendo*, &c. It  
being no reason that the King should be the Churches Hackney with-  
out any consent of his own.—But if any Prince should Pervert  
these advantages to a Persecution, we must then do our duty,  
and fear no Sufferings. *Id. p. 122.*

We hold our Benefices by humane Right, our Offices of Priests  
and Bishops by Divine Right and Humane Right. But put the  
case we did hold our Bishopricks only by Humane Right, is it one  
of your cases of Conscience, that a Sovereign Prince may justly  
take away from his Subjects any thing, which they hold by Hu-  
mane Right? If one man take from another, that which he holds  
justly by the Law of Man, he is a Thief and a Robber by the Law  
of God. *Bramhal Vindict. Ord. p. 77.*

The substance of what has been said upon these two last *Queries*  
amounts to this,

1. That

1. That *Toleration* may excuse a *Schismatick* from the *Penalty*, but not from the *guilt* of *Schism*.

2. That *Communicating* with *Schismatics*, because *Tolerated*, makes the crime less *dangerous*, but not less *sinful*.

3. That, tho' *Persecution* or extreme *Severity* in *Governours* may make some men thro' *humane frailty*, to comply with a *Schismatical Church*, yet that will not excuse them from *Schism* in the sight of *God*; because they ought to obey *God* rather than *Man*.

4. That, tho' the *Prince* be *Supreme* in *Ecclesiastical* Causes, yet he cannot alter *Religion* at his pleasure, or injoin a *Sinful Worship*; and if he do's 'tis no *Sin*, but a *duty* to disobey him.

5. The *Bishops* and *Governors* of the *Church* in such a case, are bound to defend the *Rights* of the *Church* against him, as the *Primitive Christians* did against the *Heathen Emperours*.

6. That all, even *Kings*, are liable to *Church Censures*.

Q. Whether a *Prince*, being *Excommunicated* by the *Church*, may be *Resisted*, *Depos'd*, or *Murder'd* by his *Subjects*.

Falkner  
Christian  
Loyalty  
P. 316.

A. It is contrary to the nature of *Excommunication*, tho' in the highest degree, that any person, and especially a *Sovereign Prince*, should thereby lose those *Temporal Rights* which are not founded in their relation to the *Church*. Indeed in *Christian Kingdoms* there are ordinarily some *Temporal Penalties*, and abatement of *Legal Privileges* inflicted upon the persons *Excommunicate*: But this is not the *natural Effect* of that sentence, but is added thereto by the *Civil Government* and *Sovereignty*, under which such persons do live. And therefore no such thing can take place with respect to *Sovereign Princes*, who have no *Temporal Superiour* to annex this as a *Penalty*.

Id. 318.

*Sovereign Princes* are not liable to the Sentence of *Excommunication*, in the same manner with *Christian Subjects*.—A *Sovereign* is capable of losing and forfeiting his relation to the *Society* of the *Christian Church*, as well as other persons; because as *Mr. Thorndike* (*Rt. of the Ch. Ch.* 4. p. 236.) observes he, as well as others, comes into the *Communion of the Church*, upon the terms and conditions of *Christianity*; and a failure in the condition must make the effect void.—The effect of *Excommunication* is such, that it sometimes prohibits *Converse* among private persons; except in such *Relations*, as do not depend upon the *Society of the Church*, and therefore remain intire, notwithstanding the *Separation*, from that



that Society; as of Parents and Children, Husband and Wife, Master and Servant. And upon this Account, no *Subject* can, by virtue of *Excommunication*, be prohibited Converse with and discharge of all Duty and Respect to his *Sovereign*; because this is that which he owes him by the bond of *Allegiance*, and the *Laws of Nature, Humane Society, and Civil Policy*.

As for the Objection, That Excommunicate Persons are not to be convers'd with, by *St. Paul's Rule*, it is answer'd by all Divines, That it ceaseth, in such Relations (for example of Parents and Children) as more Ancient than the Society of the Church, which it therefore presupposeth: and so is to cease, in things necessary to Civil Society) which Christianity, as it presupposeth, so it enforceth, and not overthroweth.

The Church of *England* always Declar'd against, absolutely Condemn'd, and utterly Detest'd, Abhor'd and Abjur'd, that Damnable Doctrine and Position, as *Impious* and HERETICAL, That *Princes who are Excommunicated by the Pope [or any other Bishop] may be Deposed or Murdered by their Subjects, or any other whatsoever*.

Not only those Assertions which directly contradict the Articles of our *Creed*, but those also which Oppose the Necessary Rules and Precepts of a Holy life, which are a Considerable part of the *Christian Faith and Doctrine* have generally been esteem'd HERETICAL Doctrines in the Church of God.

In the Council of *Constance* That Assertion, That an *ill Governing Prince may Lawfully or Meritoriously be kill'd, by his Subject or Vassal, was condemn'd as erroneous in Faith and Manners, and rejected as HERETICAL*.

Those who in Communion with the Church of *England*, embrace that True Christian Doctrine, which was taught in the Primitive and Apostolical Church, are as far from being concern'd in the crime and guilt of *Heresy*, as *Loyal Subjects* are from being Chargeable with *Rebellion*.

Among all the HERESIES this Age has spawn'd, there is not one more contrary to the whole design of Religion, and more destructive of Mankind, than that Bloody Opinion of Defending Religion by Arms, and forcible Resistance upon the Colour of preserving Religion. The Wisdom of this Policy is Earthly, Sensual and Devilish, Savouring of a Carnal, Unmortifi'd and Unpatriot Mind that cannot bear the Cross, nor Trust the Providence of GOD.

Have we some that deny the Kings Supremacy, and hold it lawful to Depose and Murder Kings? We owe these Tenets and Practices to the Church of *Rome*.

Thornd.  
Re. of the  
Church.  
p. 238.  
Vid. Catb.  
Bal. 110.  
111. and  
p. 20.

Oath of  
Alleg.

Falkner  
Christ.  
Loyal.  
p. 326.

Id. p. 329.

Id. p. 322.

Pres. to  
Vind. Ch.  
and State  
of Scot.

Long's  
Char. of  
Sep. p. 36.

A Protestant Rebel (said the Blessed Martyr K. Ch. 1st) in the same degree of Rebellion with a Papist, hath far more to answer, as having more light, and it being more expressly against the Religion he professeth, whereof it hath hitherto been a Maxim (tho it be now taken for Apocryphal Doctrine) not to take up Arms against their Prince upon any Pretence whatsoever.

Letter to  
his Royal  
Highness  
the Duke of  
York  
1659.

Our Law-givers piously declare, That, By the Murder of our late great and dread Sovereign, the Protestant Religion hath received the greatest Wound and Reproach, and the People of England the most supportable Shame that was possible for the Enemies of God and the King to bring upon us. 22. Car. 2. c. 30.

Tillotson's  
Letter to  
my Ld.  
Russel in  
Newgate  
July, 20.  
1683.

I do humbly offer to your Lordships deliberate thoughts the following Considerations concerning the Points of Resistance.

First that the Christian Religion doth plainly forbid the Resistance of Authority.

2dly. That tho our Religion be Establish'd by Law, (which our Lordship urges as a difference between our Case, and that of the Primitive Christians) yet in the same Law which establish'd our Religion it is declar'd, That it is not Lawful upon any pretence whatsoever to take up Arms, &c. Besides that there is a particular Law declaring the Power of the Militia to be solely in the King. And that ties the hands of Subjects, tho the Law of Nature and the general Rules of Scripture had left us at liberty, which I believe they do not, because the Government and Peace of Human Society could not well subsist upon these Terms.

3dly. Your Lordships opinion is contrary to the Declar'd Doctrine of all Protestant Churches, and tho some particular Persons have taught otherwise, yet they have been contradicted herein and condemn'd for in by the Generality of Protestants, and I beg your Lordship to consider how it will agree with an avow'd deserting of the Protestant Religion, to go contrary to the General Doctrine of Protestants: &c.

Dr. Pel-  
lings Good  
Sermons  
old way P.  
115.

Bochanan,  
Gilby,  
Goodman,

De jure  
Regni.

It is so notorious, that it needs not proof, that our right Kings & Estates have held it Lawful, not only not to Obey wicked Kings (whom they call wicked) but also to resist them, to take Arms against them, to have no further regard to them than if they were the most simple Subjects within their Realms, to Excommunicate them, to Depose them, to Un-king them, to take their Crowns and Thrones from them, and so Banish or Imprison them. For according to Buchanan and his whole Tribe, the Bond being broken between the People and the King, he loseth all his Power and Authority which he had by Contract from the people. This is Jesuitism with a witness, or else

have been *Unjust* in Charging this Doctrine upon the *Jesuits*.

That the Authority of Supreme Lawful Magistrates is Divine *Id. Serm.*  
 and ever hath been, the plain and honest Doctrine of the Church 30. Jan.  
 of England. And I should have wonder'd how any wise man should 78. p. 13,  
 not see it in the *Homily against Rebellion*, but that I do consider, 14.  
 that that *Homily* is a *Looking-glass*, wherein those who have been  
*Troopers*, cannot but see their own *guilt* and *Deformity*, and there-  
 fore do not care to look at all into it.

He that lifts up his hand against the *Lord's Anointed* strikes *Id. p. 9.*  
 at the Face of God himself.

Our Church doth not only teach [Non-Resistance] as her own *Vind. Anf.*  
 Doctrine; but which is more effectual, as the Doctrine of Christ, to the Kgs.  
 and his Apostles and of the Primitive Church. papers. p.  
 89.

If there can be no clear way of reconciling the Terroure met-  
 with'd by St. Greg. Nazianzen's Father, Bp. of Nazianzen against  
 Julian's Captain of Archers, sent to rob and overthrow the Church  
 of Nazianzen with the Rules of *Christian Patience*, yet perhaps  
 there may be to reconcile it with *Loyalty*; for Julian was a Re-  
 bell against his Emperour *Constantinus* — So having forfeited  
 all Right of Succession to *Constantinus* by Rebellion, and not being ex-  
 cited by the Lawful Army of *Constantinus*, he was no other than  
 a *Oliver Cromwell* had been in England, if all the Royal Family  
 and Relations had been extinct. So that if it were not done  
 like a *Martyr*, calmly to permit the Wolf to raven as he hoped,  
 it was no opposition to any Lawful Prince, or His Commis-  
 sioner, but an *Usurper* and his Elf: And for any thing I know,  
 prudential and Venial, if no more than so, if not also *laudable*.  
 And on this ground the Solemn *Liturgies* us'd openly against him,  
 and the Commendations bestow'd on him that Kill'd him, tho  
 one of his own Army, may be justifi'd, not upon the Account  
 merely of persecuting Christianity, had he been a Lawful Prince,  
 but for that he was an *Usurper* only of the Empire, no Lawful  
 Emperour according to the Rules of Imperial Election. &c. a  
*Oliver Cromwell* and *Tyrannical Intruder* &c.

The substance of what is said in answer to this Query is this,

1. That Christian Princes, tho they are liable to Church Censures,  
 they are not to Temporal Penalties, as *Deposition*, *Exile*, *Death*.
2. That the Doctrine of Resisting and Deposing Lawful Princes,  
 pretence of *Excommunication*, or any other pretence whatso-  
 ever is Damnable and Heretical, contrary to the Laws of this Realm,  
 contrary to the Doctrine, not only of our Church, and all Pro-  
 testants

testants, but of Christ and his Apostles, and the Primitive Christians.]  
*Faith and Practice of* 3. That the Crown [in Hereditary and Successive Monarchies] is not liable to be *Disposed, Alienated, or Sold*; nor doth it depend on any *Election, or Choice of the People*.  
*Ch. Eng. man.*  
 cap. 6.

4. That Monarchy hath at least as good a Title to all its Powers, Rights, and Privileges, as any of its Subjects can have to their Honours, Properties and Estates, and if *Subjects* lose no Temporal Rights by Excommunication, certainly *Princes* ought not.

Q. *Whether the People are not oblig'd to Communicate with the Establish'd Church, if Superiour in Number to any other Communion, and more firmly United?*

A. If the *Establish'd Religion* be *Corrupt in Doctrine and Worship*, as in *Popish Countries*, or *Schismatical*, as in some *Protestant Kingdoms and States*, they ought not to Communicate with them, tho' their Numbers be never so great, and they never so closely United. For if it be sinful to Communicate with a false, or *Schismatical Church* (as it certainly is) its being *establish'd* can never make it no Sin.

*Apologist* It is not the great *Number* of Church Members in any *Dioce,*  
*Vind. Ch.* Province or Patriarchate, but the *Cause and Nature* of the Communion that makes a True Church.  
*Eng. p. 37.*

*Id. p. 39.* — As I observ'd before, it is not the *Number* of Communicants, but the *Cause or Soundness* of Communion that makes a true Church; and therefore were there both for Kind and Number, ten times as many more Opposite Sects and Communions, as there are in the Nation, and *Bishops* at the Heads of them all, yet upon Supposition that the Church of *England* is sound and Apostolical in *Doctrine, Worship, and Discipline*, that small number, adhering to her Communion, must be the True Church. Nay if all the *Bishops of England*, but One, should fall away from the Church of *England*, that One Bishop, and the flock adhering to him, would be the True Church of *England*, and as True and Catholick a Church, as if there were not one *Dissenter* in the Land.

*Ans. to several* Truth is to be follow'd with a Few, if there are but Few that follow it; but thou shalt not follow a Multitude to do evil.  
*Capt. Quer.*

*P. 12.* Truth is the same and changeth not, whether they be Few or Many that profess it; and our Religion stands not in a Multitude of Pretenders, but in a Holy Doctrine and a Holy Practice, which all ought to follow, even when the most do not.  
*Id. p. 16.*



He who denies that the *Major* part of the Guides of the Jewish Church err'd, must also deny Christ, since by such *Church Authority* he was rejected. He who will determine the Prince to Judge alwaies with the Majority of Church Guides obligeth him in *Elijah's* time to establish *Baalism*; and at other times *Calf-Worship*. *Reflect. on Hist. part of Ch. Gov. pt. 5. p. 96.*

If truth be alwaies on the side of the greatest Number, Blackhalls which was the *True Church* in *Abraham's* time, when he was of a Religion by himself? Was it in his small family, or amongst the *Idolatrous Nations*, that dwelt round about him; or which was the *True Church* in all that long tract of time from *Moses* to our *Saviour*? was it not Confin'd to a very small spot of Land, even when it was at its largest extent? And that again Contracted to a much less compass in *Elijah's* time, when there were not in ten of the *Tribes of Israel*, above 7000 men who had not bow'd the Knee to the Image of *BAAL*. 1 Kings. 19. 18. *Serm. p. 6.*

Again if that be alwaies the *True Church*, which is the Largest, time was when the *Arian Hereticks* were the *true Christian Church*, and the *Orthodox Professors of Christianity* ( who were but a very few in Number in Comparison with them ) were consequently miserably deluded, and rank Hereticks. *Id. ibid.*

In the Text we are told, that many of our *Lord's Disciples* ( probably not fewer than 5000 ) went away from him at once, and ( as far as appears by the History ) there were only 12 that remain'd with him, a very small number in comparison with the great Multitude that went away; and yet there can be no doubt, but that these were the *True Church*, and that they which went away were *Schismatics*. *Id. p. 5.*

Multitude may render a Sect Formidable, but 'tis but a poor Argument of Right. *Vind. pr. Ch. p. 151. The Protestants*

Suppose we were by much the Fewer: So hath the Church of God often been, without any the least prejudice of the Truth of their Religion. What think we of the Church in *Abraham's* Time, which for ought we know was confin'd to one family, and one small Kingdom, that of *Melchisedeck King of Salem*? What think we of it in *Moses's* Time, when it was confin'd to one People wandering in a Wilderness? What of it in *Elijah's* Time, when besides the Two Tribes that worshiped in *Jerusalem*, there were in the other Ten but Seven Thousand that had not bow'd the Knee to *Baal*? What in our *Saviour's* Time, when the whole Church consisted of Twelve Apostles, and Seventy Disciples, and some few *Religion vindicated from the charge of Singularity in a Sermon preached before the King at Whitehall by Dr. Tillotson. April. 2. fol. 168o.*

followers besides? How would *Bellarmin* have despis'd this little Flock, because it wanted one or two of his goodliest Marks of the True Church, *Universality*, and *Splendor*? And what think we of the Christian Church in the Height of *Arianism* and *Pelagianism*, when a great part of Christendom was over-run with these Errors, and the Number of the Orthodox was inconsiderable in comparison of Hereticks? But what need I urge these instances? As if the truth of Religion were to be estimated and carry'd by the *Major Vote*; which, as it can be an Argument to none but *Fools*, So I dare say no *Honest and Wise man* ever made use of it &c.

*Apologes.* The Revolt [ to *Donatism* ] in all parts of *Africa*, was so general that the Catholick Communions look'd more like *Confederacies*, than the *Catholick Church*.

*Vind. p.* 20. *Id. p. 45.* It is not *bare Union*, but the things in which a Church is united, that must truly recommend and justify it to the Christian world, and prove it to be the Church of God.

*Id. p. 46.* I believe there never was a more perfect Union and Agreement in the Church of *Rome* [ or in any other Church ] than among the *Israelites* which worshiped the Golden Calf; nevertheless it was no Schism to divide from them, because they United in a *Sin*. Their Union was their *Crime*.

*Id. p. 47.* The *Corabites* were as firmly United under *Corah*, as the True Church was under *Moses* and *Aaron*—The ten Tribes were as firmly united at *Beahel*, as the two were at *Hierusalem*; they had *Numbers*, as well as *Union*, to plead, but, notwithstanding both their Number and Union, they were but a great *Schism*, because they united in Innovations, contrary to the will of God.

*Id. 47.* There hath been at several times as strict an Union among *Hereticks* and *Schismatics*, as among the *Catholicks*.

The *Novatianists* in particular were remarkable for their Concord, Unity and Unanimity. So were the *Arians* generally all of one Communion, and very Unanimous against the *Homonian* Doctrine, and yet they were but a great prevailing Schism when they were at the highest, and had almost gain'd the whole Christian World.

*Id.* From these examples 'tis plain that in passing Judgment upon Churches we are not to look at the *Union*, so much as the *Cause* in which they are united. We are to Consider if their Doctrine and Discipline be Apostolical, and their Terms of Communion truly Catholick, and if they be so, then their Union in them is Holy

Holy and Laudable, and such as makes them the true Churches of God. A Concurrence of these things is the genuine Badge of a truly Catholick and Apostolical Church.

The worst Fraternities have sometimes the firmest Union; as *Id.* p. 55. we of this Nation very well remember the Time, when those of the *Great Rebellion* boasted, that God had united the *Hearts* of his People in his Cause, as one Man; nevertheless those pretended People of God, whose *Hearts* and *Hands* were so United, that we could not break their Bonds of Union asunder, were no better than a *Band of Rebels*, and their Cause downright *Rebellion* against God, and the best of Princes, tho they acted in it as if they had been all inform'd with one Common Soul. The like hath often happen'd in Ecclesiastical Societies: The *Samaritans*, who had neither *Sadduces* nor *Pharisees*, nor *Essens* nor *Herodians*, nor *Cabalists* nor *Caraites* among them, for that reason had a firmer Union among themselves, than the Church of the Jews had, and yet they were not the True Church. So among the Ancient Christians, The *Novatians* liv'd in perfect Peace and Unity among themselves, when there were many Fends and Contentions among the Catholicks: which shews that bare Unity is not a good Test whereby to try Churches.

The Sum of what is said upon this *Query* is,  
That 'tis *Sameness* in *Doctrine*, *Discipline* and *Worship* that makes a True Church, and not *Number* and *Union*.

Q. Whether a well-meaning Christian may not now and then, or Occasionally Communicate with a Schismatical Church?

A. We must not give countenance to the Church Assemblies [of Schismaticks] by our presence among them, if we can avoid it.

Now if there be but one Catholick Church all the World over, then every Separation is a Schism on one side or other; for where there are two Separate Churches, one, if not both, must be Schismatical, because there is but one Church: And if the Unity of this Church consists in one Communion, which exacts a joynt discharge of all the Duties of a Church-relation, in Hearing, and Praying, and Receiving the Lord's Supper, &c. together, then to forsake the Church and meet in private Conventicles, in *Distinct* and *Opposite* Communions, for Religious Worship, is *Separation*; and when it is *Causes*, is a *Schism*.

Sander-  
son's *Cate-*  
of the *Li-*  
turg. p.  
195.  
*Vind. Def.*  
of D. St.  
p. 5.

You

Sherl.

Resol. of  
some Cases.

You cannot be in Communion with two Churches which are in a State of Separation from each other— for to be in Communion with a Church is to be a Member of it, and to be a Member of two Separate and Opposite Churches, is to be as contrary to our selves, as those Separate Churches are to each other.

Def. of  
Dr. Stil.

P. 235.

Wherever there are distinct and Separate Communion and Churches, which do not own Church-membership with each other, but, tho they live in the same place, yet divide into several distinct Congregations, under different Governors and Opposite Orders and Rules, there is certainly a Schism on one side or other: where there are two distinct and opposite Communion, one of them must be Schismatical, because there ought to be but One.

Def. of

Still. p. 63.

To assert that there are more True Churches than one (how large or narrow soever the bounds of it be, which were not very large in the first Institution of a Church, and may be reduc'd again to a narrow Compass, by a general Apostacy) is to justify Schism by a Law; for then there may be Distinct Churches, and Distinct Opposite Communion without Schism, which is the most Schismatical Principle in the World, if Christ have but One Church and One Body.

Ans. to  
Protest.  
Recon.  
P. 332.

It is impossible to joyn in Communion with such men without Judging and Censuring those whom I believe, in those very Acts of Worship, in which I joyn with them, to be either Superstitious or profane, and therefore tho' such men should worship in the same Church, or Religious Assemblies, yet they do not worship in One Communion.

Mischief of  
Separ. p.  
56.

It is hard to understand, if *occasional Communion* be *Lawful*, that *constant Communion* should not be a *Duty*.

Sherl. disc.  
of Nas.  
Un. and  
Communi-  
on &c. p.  
41.  
Lowth's  
Catechism.

*Q. Whether Salvation may be had out of the Church?*

*A.* It is Universally agreed that there is no Salvation to be had out of the Catholick Church.

Infidels, Jews, Turks, &c. that never were in the Church; Hereticks that have forsaken or *Corrupted* the Faith, that was once deliver'd to the Saints; Schismaticks that have *divided* themselves; and Excommunicate Persons that are *Cut off* from the Communion of the Church, without Reconciliation, cannot be sav'd. For most certain is that Rule of St. Cyprian and St. Austin, *He shall not have God to be his Father, that will not have the Church to be his Mother.*

We



We cannot run our Spiritual Race unless we be in the Church, for there is no Prize, no Crown to run for out of it. And therefore those who lose, as well as those who win the prize must be in the Church and Members of it.

Sherl. *Def.*  
of *Natur.*  
and *com. of*  
*Cath. Ch.*  
p. 28.

Catholick Communion is our Union in one Body, and Communicating in this one Body is the exercise of Catholick Communion, which those who do not, if there be not a just and necessary Cause for it, are Schismatics for all that, whatever their Faith and Worship be; and Schism is a Damning Sin.

*Vind. of*  
*Prot. Prin.*  
p. 34.

To disobey our Governors, the Bishops and Pastors of the Church, &c. hath been ever in the Church of God accounted Schism, and that Schism Damnable.

Long's  
*Char. of a*  
*Sep.* p. 90.

We [ Church of *England* and *Rome* ] are thus far agreed, that Schism and Herefy are dangerous sins, destructive of the Peace and Order, the well being at least, if not the Being of Gods Church, and such sins, as without a true and timely Repentance, will unavoidably and eternally ruin those that are guilty of them.

*Preface to*  
*Vind. Ch.*  
*E. from*  
*Sch.*

The Being and Well-being of the Church are incompatible with Schism, and it is not only Evil because God hath forbid it, but God hath forbid it, because he knew it was Evil and pernicious in its Nature to his *One* Catholick Church.

*Apolog.*  
*Vind. &c.*  
p. 93.

Wilful Schism is in all Cases a Damning Sin.

*Vind. Def.*  
p. 401. &  
415.

Wilful Schism puts men out of the State of Salvation.

Christ has made Schism a Damning sin to give Authority to the Church.

*Ans. to*  
*Prot. Rec.*

Separation from the Church of *England* is a Schism, and Schism is as damning a Sin, as Idolatry, Drunkenness or Adultery.

p. 192.  
*Vind.*  
*Def.* p.

The Church which is the Schismatick, according to the language of the Primitive times, is out of the Catholick Church *Extra Ecclesiam foris*.

389.  
*Sher. Ans.*  
*to Anonym.*

All Ministerial Gifts are for the Edification of Christs Body, which supposes, that their Efficacy, and Influence is confin'd to the Communion of the Church, and does not reach the *Conventicles* of Schismatics.

*Vind.*  
*Def.* p. 60.  
*Sherl. Vind.*  
p. 111.

The Increase and Edification of Christians is in the Unity of the Church, and Consists in the increase of Brotherly Love and Christian Charity, Virtues which cannot be learn'd in a Schism.

*Id. Ibid.*

Christ's Church was never enlarg'd yet by the preaching of Schismatics, which divides and lessens the Church, but will never enlarge it.

*Ans. to Prot.*  
*Reconciler*  
p. 419.

Long's Char. Sep. p. 13. There is no doubt, but the Spirit of God is departed from him, who is departed from the Unity of the Church.

Hellier's Treatise of Schis. p. 55. Schismatics have not the kind Influences of the H. Spirit, whereby the Church is govern'd. Whence not only all their Gifts, but all their Good works are utterly spoil'd and come to nothing. As a part cannot retain its sense and life, when it is out off from the Body; as the Branch cannot bear fruit except it abide in the vine; as a Rivulet is soon dry'd up when separated from the fountain; as a Ray cannot subsist, when taken away from the Sun; so neither can a Schismatick Reap any profit from his Gifts or Good works, when separated from the rest of the Church of Christ.

Jo. 15. 4. Some are not sensible that it is any great harm to go amongst them [i.e. Schismatics] to pray with them, or to hear the Gospel Preach'd. But to joyn with them in those, otherwise, Holy offices, is the way to become partakers of their sins, *Their Sacrifices shall be to them as the Bread of Mourning, all that Eat thereof shall be polluted. Where two or three are gather'd together in Christ's Name, there is He in the midst of them; not when they are gather'd against his Name, and against the other Members of the Church.* Such mens Prayers are not only ineffectual but execrable.

Id. p. 57. Their Prayers and Preaching and other parts of Divine worship being perform'd in Opposition to the other Members of the Church, are turn'd into sin; and *They Come together, as the Corinthians (1 Cor. 11. 17.) in a Division of Theirs, not for the Better but for the worse.*

Id. p. 58. The efficacy of the Prayers of the Church, depends upon the Unity of the Church.

Thorn-dike's Re. of the Ch. p. 126. It is agreed upon by the whole Church, that *Baptism in Heresy or Schism*, (that is, when a Man gives up himself to the Communion of Hereticks, or Schismatics, by receiving Baptism from them) tho it may be *True Baptism*, and not to be repeated, being given in the Form of the Church; yet is not *Available to Salvation*; making him accessory to Heresy or Schism, that is so Baptiz'd.

Sherl. vind. p. 109. We being many are *one Bread and one Body*, for we are all partakers of that *one Bread*; and upon this account it is call'd the *Communion of the Body of Christ*.—And therefore the *Body of Christ cannot be receiv'd in a Schism*. For where there is a Schism, it is no longer *one Bread and Body*, nor the Communion of Christ's Body.

1 Cor. 10. 17.

Body when it is divided into different and Opposite Communi-  
ons. That which is the Common Bread of all Christians must be re-  
ceiv'd in Unity and one Communion; for it loseth its Nature, Vir-  
tue, and Efficacy in a Schism.

If our Saviour would not allow any man to offer any Sacrifice to God, who had a private quarrel with his Brother, till he had reconcil'd himself to him, how unlikely is it, that God will hear the Prayers of those men who are at variance with the Church of God, and divide the Communion of it? Id. p. 110.

Schism indeed we do say, is a damning sin; but there may be Divisions where there is not alwaies the Guilt and Formality of Schism; and we hope this is the Case of all good men, who se-  
parate from the Church, thro some invincible prejudices and pre-  
possessions. Sherlock's Sermon. Nov. 4. 1688. p. 22.

—If men be sincerely honest and do fall into Schism, thro an Innocent mistake, God will be merciful to them, which secures the final happiness of Good men. Ans. to Prov. Reconciler p. 153.

The substance of what has been said in Answer to these two last Queries is this,

1. That if Christ has but *One Church*, out of which Salvation is not *ordinarily* to be had, then all Christians are obliged, as they tender the Salvation of their Souls, to keep intire Communion with that *One Church*, and not to run, for fear, *Worldly interest, or wantonness*, from the Church to the *Conventicle*, and from the *Conventicle* back again to the Church.

2. That if neither *Prayers, Preaching* nor *Sacraments* have any Efficacy or *Virtue*, unless administred in the *Unity* of the Church, Nay if they are *pernicious* and *Execrable*, it behoves all *Dissenters* to forsake and renounce all their *Schismatical Meetings*, and to recon-  
cile themselves to the Church.

3. That if those only, who thro *Ignorance* and *prejudice*, or the like, Communicate with *Schismaticks*, may, and that by Gods *Extraordinary Mercy* too, be sav'd, then those who are guilty of *Wilful Schism*, or, *wantonly* gad from the Church to *Schismatical Conventicles*, and are therefore really members of no Church, are in a de-  
perate Condition.

S I R,

According to my promise, I have given you the Opinions of some of our Eminent Episcopal Divines upon all your Queries; and could have added many more if needful, and upon the whole you will find that they are fully agreed, that those who forsake either the Communion of *Lawful*, and *Canonical* Bishops, and set up others in *Opposition* to them; or wholly reject the *Order*, are notwithstanding any *Dispensation*, *Exemption*, *Toleration*, or even *Legal Establishment*, Compleat *Schismatics*.

Long's  
Answer to  
Hale  
p. 84.

To conclude, *Communion* is the *Strength* and *ground* of all *Society*, whether *Sacred* or *Civil*: whoever therefore they be, that offend against this *Common Society*, and *Friendliness* of men, and *Cause Separation* and *Breach* among them, if it be in *Civil* occasions, are guilty of *Sedition* or *Rebellion*; if it be by occasion of *Ecclesiastical* Differences, they are guilty of *Schism*.

Therefore let you and I and all Good Christians and Loyal Subjects pray, as our Church in her Litany directs, from all *Sedition*, *privy Conspiracy*, and *Rebellion*; from all false *Doctrine*, *Heresy* and *Schism*, Good Lord deliver us. And Let us beseech Almighty God that he would be pleas'd to bring into the way of Truth all such as have err'd, and are deceiv'd; to strengthen such as do stand; to comfort and help the weak-hearted; to raise up them that fall, and finally to beat down Satan (the Author, and Abetter of *Schism* and *Rebellion*) under our feet—I am,

S I R,

Yours &amp;c.

Post-



## Postscript.

SIR,

UPON the Review, I find my self oblig'd to beg your pardon for two things. The one, for not Answering your *Queries* in the same Order as you propos'd them, and for adding one or two of my own. The other, for making my *References* so very short. As for the First, I shall presume upon your pardon, because it was done with a good design, viz. to make the whole more clear and intelligible. As for the other, I think I have aton'd, by sending you, together with the *Abbreviations*, the Titles at length of most of the Books, the Bookellers Names, the Years when Printed, and the Authors Names, where they are set to the Books; and, where they are not, the Names of the suppos'd Authors, in Crotchets, as you'll see by the following Catalogue.

*Field of the Ch.* Of the Church five Books by Richard Field &c. the 2d. Edition, at Oxford, imprinted by William Turner &c. 1628. Fol. 7.

*Hom. of Sch.* The 2d. Vol. of the Works of the Reverend and Learned H. Hammond D. D. the 2d. Edition London printed for R. Royson and R. Davis in Oxford 1684.

*Mem. Lon. Try.* A true Narrative of all the proceedings against the Id. Bp. of London in the Council Chamber at Whitehall, by the Lords Commissioners appointed by his Majesty to inspect Ecclesiastical affairs. London, Printed and are to be sold by Randal Taylor near Stationer's-Hall. 1689.

*Dr. Lloyd's Sermon.* on Act. 2. 42. A Sermon preach'd before the King at Whitehall Nov. 24. 1678. by William Lloyd D. D. and Dean of Bangor and Chaplain &c. London, printed for H. Brome 1679. Quarto.

*Ser. Misc. Separ.* The Mischief of Separation, a Sermon preach'd at Guildhall Chapel, May 2. 1680 before the Lord Mayor by Ed. Stillingfleet, D. D. Dean of St. Paul's, &c. London, printed for H. Mortlock at the Phoenix in St. Paul's Church-Yard, &c. 1680.

*Ser. unreason. Separ.* The Unreasonableness of Separation: or an impartial account of the History, Nature and Pleas of the present Separation, &c. by Edward Stillingfleet D. D. Dean of St. Paul's &c. London, printed for H. Mortlock. 1681.

*Wor. Case.* The Difference of the case between the Separation of Protestants from the Church of Rome, and the Separation of Dissenters.

- ters from, &c. by Dr. Clager. *London*, printed for Tho. Bassett and Fincham Gardiner. 1683.
- Prot. Resol. Faith.* Protestant Resolution of Faith, in Answer to three Questions, &c. by Dr. Sherlock, *London*, printed 1685.
- Ans. to the Kgs. Paps.* An Answer to some Papers lately printed concerning the Authority of the Cath. Church in matters of Faith and Reformation of the Church of *England* [by Dr. Stillingfleet] *London*, printed for R. Chiswell. 1686.
- Vind. of Ans. to the Kgs. Paps.* A Vindication of the Answer to some late Papers concerning the Unity and Authority of the Cath. Church, and the Reformation of the Church of *England* [by Ed. Stillingfleet D. D.] *London*, printed for R. Chiswell. 1687.
- Apolog. Vind. Ch. Eng.* An Apologetical Vindication of the Church of *England*: in Answer to those who reproach her with the English Heresies and Schisms, or suspect her not to be a Catholic Church, upon their account [by Geo. Hicks D. D.] *London*, printed for Walter Ketilby, 1687.
- Vindie. Ch. Eng. from Sch.* A Vindication of the Church of *England* from the foul Aspersions of Schism and Heresy unjustly cast upon her by the Church of *Rome*, pt. 1st. [by Mr. Altham] *London*, printed for Luke Meredith. 1687.
- Plain fam. Disc.* A plain and Familiar Discourse by way of Dialogue betwixt a Minister and his Parishioner, concerning the Cath. Church, in three parts &c. by a Divine of the Church of *England* [Dr. Freeman] *London* printed for R. Clavel and B. Took 1687.
- Ans. to Reasf. and Author.* An Answer to a Book entitul'd Reason and Authority: or the Motives of a Late Protestants Reconciliation to the Cath. Church, &c. in a Letter to a Freind [by Dr. Barbrigg] *London*, printed for Brab. Aylmer. 1687.
- Animadvers. 8 Thes.* Animadversions on the Eight *Thes.* laid down, and the Inferences deduc'd from them in a Discourse entitul'd Church Government. Part 3. lately printed at *Oxford* [by Mr. Atterbury] *Oxford*, printed at the Theatre Anno. 1687.
- Reflect. Hist. pr. Ch. Govern.* Reflections on the Historical part of Church Government, part 5. [by Mr. Smadge,] *Oxford*, printed at the Theatre, Anno. 1687.
- Reform. justif.* The Reformation of the Church of *England* justify'd according to the Canons of the Council of *Nice*, and other General Councils, and the Tradition of the Cath. Church, being an Answer to a Paper reprinted at *Oxford*, call'd [The Schism

the Church of England ] demonstrated in four Arguments, &c. [ by Dr. Saywell ] Cambridge, Printed for Ed. Hall, 1688.

*Discourse Nat. Unity.* &c. A Discourse concerning the Nature, Unity, and Communion of the Cath. Church wherein most of the Controversies Relating to the Church are briefly and plainly stated pt. 1st. by Will. Sherlock. D. D. and Master of the Temple. London, printed for William Rogers 1688.

*Several Capt. Quer.* Several captious Queries concerning the English Reformation first propos'd by Dean Manby, &c. briefly and fully Answer'd by Dr. Clager. London, printed for James Adamsen. 1688.

*Cath. Bal.* The Catholick Balance; or a Discourse determining the Controversies concerning, 1. The Tradition of Cath. Doctrines. 2. The Primacy of St. Peter and the Bishop of Rome. 3. The Subjection and Authority of the Church in a Christian State, &c. [ by Mr. Hill of Killmanton in Somersetshire ] London, printed for R. Clavel 1687.

*Sherl. Sermon Nov.* 4. 88. A Sermon preach'd before the Right Honourable the Lord Mayor and Aldermen of the City of London, at the Guildhall Chapel on Sunday Nov. 4. 1688. by W. Sherlock D.D. Mr. of the Temple. London, printed for Will. Rogers, 1689.

*Ande. same Prot. Princ.* A Vindication of some Protestant Principles of Church Unity and Cath. Communion from the charge of Agreement with the Church of Rome [ by Dr. Sherlock ]

*Ans. to Anonym.* A Letter to Anonymus, in Answer to his three Letters to Dr. Sherlock about Church Communion.

*Rev. M. H's. new notion. Sch.* A Review of M. H's. new Notion of Schism, and the Vindication of it. London, printed for E. Mory, 1692.

*Hellier's Treat. Sch.* A Treatise concerning Schism and Schismatics, &c. by Hen. Hellier D. D. fellow of CCC. Oxon. London, printed by R. Smith for John Crosley Bookseller in Oxford. 1697.

*Marshall visit. Sermon.* A Sermon preach'd at Brentwood in Essex Oct. 7. 1693 at the Visitation, &c. by Offsp. Blackall. 2d. Edition. London, printed for W. Rogers 1699.

*Presb. Regul. Press.* A Letter to a Member of Parliament, shewing the necessity of regulating the Press, Oxford printed 1699.

*Just Weights and Measures.* Just Weights and Measures, That is, the present State of Religion weigh'd in the Balance and measur'd by the Standard of the Sanctuary, according to the opinion of

Herbert

*Herbert Thorndike. The 2d. Edition. London, Printed for J. Alsop 1680.*

- 8vo. *Def. Unreason. Separ.* A Discourse of Church Unity being a Defence of Dr. *Stillingfleet's* unreasonableness of Separation in Answer to several late Pamphlets but Principally Dr. *Owen* and Mr. *Baxter*, by a Presbyter of the Church of England. [Dr. *Sherlock*] London, printed for R. Chiswell. 1681.
- Vindic. Def. unreason. Separ.* A Continuation and Vindication of the Defence of Dr. *Stillingfleet's* Unreasonableness of Separation in Answer to Mr. *Baxter* and Mr. *Lobb* &c. by the Author of the Defence. London, printed for R. Chiswell. 1682.
- 2d pt. *unreasonable Separ.* The Unreasonableness of Separation: The 2d. part: or a further impartial Account of the History, Nature, and Pleas of the present Separation, &c. [by Mr. *Long*] London, printed for Dan. Brown at the Black Swan and without Temple Barr. 1682.
- Vindic. prim. ch.* A Vindication of the Primitive Church and Diocesan Episcopacy in Answer to Mr. *Baxter's* Church History of Bps. &c. [by H. Maurice D. D.] London, printed for Abel Smith. 1682.
- Ans. to Prot. Reconciler.* A Vindication of the Rights of Ecclesiastical Authority being an Answer to the 1st. part of the Protestant Reconciler by Wm. Sherlock D. D. Mr. of the Temple. London, printed for Abel Swale. 1685.
- Falkner's Christ. Loyal.* Christian Loyalty: or a Discourse wherein is asserted that just Royal Authority, &c. by Wm. Falkner preacher at St. Nicholas in Lyn Regis. London, printed for Walter Kestly 1679.
- Vindic. Ch. and State of Scotland.* A Vindication of the Authority, Constitution, and Laws of the Church and State of Scotland in four Conferences, &c. By Gilbert Burnet Professor of Theology in Glasgow. Printed by Robert Sanders printer to the City and University 1673.
- Bram. Just Vind.* A just Vindication of the Church of England from the unjust Aspersions of Criminal Schism, &c. By Bp. Bramhall. London, printed for John Crook 1645.
- Thornd. Rt. of the Ch.* A Discourse of the Right of the Church in a Christian State: By Herbert Thorndike. London, printed for Octavian Pullen 1649.



*of Forbear.* A Discourse of the Forbearance on the Penalties which a due Reformation requires. By *Herbert Thorndike*, &c. London, Printed for *James Collins*, 1670.

*Sch. Doctrin* of Schism fully open'd and apply'd to gather'd Churches, &c. By the Author of Toleration not to be abus'd by the Presbyterians. London, printed for *James Collins* and sold by *Abish. Brocas* in *Exon.* 1671.

*of St. Peter's Exon.* The Character of a Separatist; or Sensuality the ground of Separation. By *Tho. Long* B. D. and Prebendary of *St. Peter's Exon.* London, printed for *Walter Ketilby* 1677.

*against Hales of Schism.* Mr. *Hales's* Treatise of Schism Examind and Censur'd by *Tho. Long* B. D. and Prebendary of *Exon.* London, printed for *Walter Ketilby* 1678.

*and Practice Ch. Engl. men.* The Baile and Practice of a Church of *England* man. London, Printed for *W. Ketilby* 1688.

*and like prim. Ch. Gover.* Of the Government of Churches a discourse pointing at the Primitive form. Printed by *Roger Daniel* Printer to the University of *Cambridge*. 1691.

*Charge Sch.* Charge of Schism Continued [by *Mr. Nokes*.] London printed for *Sam. Minslip* at the *Black Bull* over against the *Royal Exchange*. 1691.

*of Unity.* Evangelical and Catholic Unity, maintain'd in the Church of *England*: or an Apology for her Government &c. By *William Saywell* D. D. and Master of *Jesus Coll.* in *Cambridge*. London printed for *Robert Scott* and *Amstons Church-hill*. 1682.

FINIS.

ERRATA

Page 9. line 13. r. *Roman*. p. 33. l. 12. for *distin.* r. of *Christ's Church*. l. 13. for of *Christ's Church*. r. *distin.* p. 36. l. 2. for of, r. off. p. 37. l. 18. for *Bisac*. r. *Sec.* p. 45. l. 4. r. *himself*. Marg. p. 43. r. *Hill's Cath.* p. 107.